

# RELIGION IN LIFE

A CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY

Vol. I

Autumn Number, 1932

No. 4

## EDITORIAL BOARD

JOHN BAILLIE

CHARLES K. GILBERT

WILBOUR E. SAUNDERS

LUCIUS H. BUGBEE

JAMES R. JOY

FREDERICK K. STAMM

DORR DIEFENDORF

JOHN W. LANGDALE

## ADVISORY COUNCIL

Harvie Branscomb

Royal G. Hall

Edwin Lewis

Edgar Sheffield Brightman

Lynn Harold Hough

McIllyar H. Lichliter

Edwin Grant Conklin

Wilbert F. Howard

Halford E. Luccock

Clarence Tucker Craig

Edward H. Kraus

Chester C. McCown

Albert Edward Day

Umphrey Lee

Harris Franklin Rall

Luther A. Weigle

Richard Roberts

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
Proposed Roads to Peace.....	Oscar Jászi 483
Books That Have Annoyed Me—and Some Others.....	Richard Roberts 494
Christianity and the Supernatural.....	J. M. Shaw 502
Antecedents of the Great Depression.....	Rockwell D. Hunt 510
The Kingdom of God Movement in Japan.....	William Axling 521
Education, the Scales for Weighing Religion.....	Stuart A. Courtis 530
Some Ethical Insights of Prophecy.....	John Paterson 540
Prologue of the Fourth Gospel: Is it Jewish, Greek, or What?..	Dudley Tyng 551
The Three Kinds of Atheism.....	Preston W. Slosson 557
Understanding the Common People.....	Robert R. Wicks 563
The Spiritual Base of Human Society.....	James M. Stiffler 570
Philosophy for Ministers.....	Charles A. Baylis 578
The Liberal Shibboleth.....	Gilbert H. Barnes 588
The Church and the Cause of Christ.....	Edward A. Steiner 594
Germany's Great Defeat.....	Harvie Branscomb 599
The Religious Note in Robert Frost.....	Gorham Munson 609
Can We Honestly Be Optimists?.....	Henry T. Hodgkin 614
Book Reviews.....	625
Bookish Brevities.....	638

Editorial correspondence should be addressed to John W. Langdale, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Business communications regarding subscriptions, etc., should be addressed to The Abingdon Press, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Entered as second-class matter January 16, 1932, at the post-office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. This number is the October, 1932, issue.

Subscription price, \$2.00 per year; postage free U. S. Possessions and Mexico; to Canada, 18 cents additional; other foreign postage, 30 cents; single copies, 75 cents.

Published by  
**THE ABINGDON PRESS**  
NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON UNIVERSITY  
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS  
LIBRARY

# Who's Who?

**WILLIAM AXLING, D.D.** Founder and Superintendent of the Tokyo Micake Tabernacle, Tokyo, Japan.

**GILBERT H. BARNES, Ph.D.** Professor of Economics and Business Administration, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio.

**CHARLES A. BAYLIS, Ph.D.** Assistant Professor of Philosophy, Brown University, Providence, R. I.

**HARVIE BRANSCOMB, Ph.D.** Professor of New Testament, Duke University, Durham, N. C.

**STUART A. COURTIS, Ph.D.** Professor of Education, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

**HENRY T. HODGKIN, M.B., M.A.** Director of Pendle Hill School, near Haverford, Pa.; former Secretary of the National Christian Council of China.

**ROCKWELL D. HUNT, Ph.D., LL.D.** Dean of the Graduate School and Professor of Economics, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Cal.

**OSCAR JÁSZI, Ph.D.** Professor of Political Science, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio. Former member of the Cabinet of Count Karolyi in Hungary; exiled when that government fell; recently became a citizen of the United States.

**GORHAM MUNSON, A.M.** Instructor in the New School for Social Research, New York City, and journalist.

**JOHN PATERSON, Ph.D.** Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis, Drew University, Madison, N. J.

**RICHARD ROBERTS, D.D.** Minister of Sherbourne United Church, Toronto, Canada.

**J. M. SHAW, M.A., D.D.** Professor, Queen's Theological College, Kingston, Ontario, Canada.

**PRESTON W. SLOSSON, Ph.D.** Associate Professor of History, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

**EDWARD A. STEINER, D.D.** Professor of Applied Christianity, Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa.

**JAMES M. STIFLER, D.D.** Until recently minister of First Baptist Church, Evanston, Ill. Now a member of the Administration staff, University of Chicago.

**DUDLEY TYNG, Ph.D.** Assistant Professor of Biblical Literature, Brown University, Providence, R. I.

**ROBERT R. WICKS, D.D.** Dean of the Chapel, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.

## STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912

**RELIGION IN LIFE**, published quarterly at New York, N. Y., for April 1, 1932.

State of New York ) ss.  
County of New York )

Before me, a Notary Public in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Arthur F. Stevens, who, having been duly sworn according to law, depose and says that he is the business manager of **RELIGION IN LIFE**, and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management, etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, embodied in section 411, Postal Laws and Regulations, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor and business manager are:

Publisher.....	The Abingdon Press, Inc.....	150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Editor.....	None.	
Managing Editor.....	None.	
Business Manager.....	Arthur F. Stevens.....	150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

2. That the owner is:

	The Abingdon Press, Inc.....	150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Owned by The Methodist Book Concern.....		150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Publishing Agents:

John H. Race.....	150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
George C. Douglass.....	420 Plum Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
O. Grant Markham.....	740 Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders and security holders as they appear on the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustees or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

5. Sworn to and subscribed before me this 31st day of March, 1932.

**ARTHUR F. STEVENS**, Business Manager.

[Seal] **EDNA G. JEROME**, Notary Public. (My commission expires March 30, 1934.)

Copyright, 1932, by The Abingdon Press, Inc. All rights reserved—no part of this magazine may be produced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher.

Printed in the United States of America



# Proposed Roads to Peace

OSCAR JÁSZI

**P**ERHAPS nothing is so characteristic of the social and political atmosphere of the period in which we are living as the growing general interest in the establishment of a permanent peace. Of course, from time immemorial there have been isolated individuals who denounced war as an offense against divine or moral law, and sometimes, especially after the sufferings of a long war, vast masses of the population have been embittered against those who started the war. Nevertheless, it remains true that it is now for the first time in history that these isolated or diffused and inarticulate protests against war have become organized, and the idea of a *pax mundi* has ceased to be the Utopian and often ridiculed thought of some noble souls or closet philosophers, but rather has become a mass movement, whose force can even upset governments; and therefore it is a movement before which the most cynical statesmen and diplomats are compelled to make at least a courteous if insincere bow.

The cause of this astonishing change, of which very few people realize the importance, is due before all to the "*advent of the demos*": to the fact that the passive toiling masses of humanity, which accepted misery, exploitation, and war as an inevitable part of the world order, now have become to a certain extent self-conscious, and repudiate all things which are contradicted by human reason or the voice of conscience. It is therefore quite natural that our modern pacifism is approximately coeval with proletarian socialism, through which another old idea of mankind has assumed a highly practical and decisive aspect. That is the reason why the idea of peace has become so popular at the present time, and has been so much abused by political orators and sentimental propagandists.

This wave of political and humanitarian oratory, however, has not been followed by an adequate intellectual effort to grasp those problems which are involved in the issue of peace, and this is a grave danger, because without a keen and sober intellectual outlook popular enthusiasm will be easily sidetracked (and is already sidetracked) by shrewd demagogues or self-gratifying sentimentalists. It is one of the chief tasks of our higher education to give a solid philosophy and a clear outlook to those who take the fight against war seriously—that is, not as an annex to the political game, but as a performance of a moral duty. That is the reason why so many universities, colleges, and peace societies are engaged in this country in innumerable courses on international relations, diplomatic and current

[ 483 ]

BOSTON UNIVERSITY  
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS  
LIBRARY

affairs, on international law and world organization. Yet, however important and gratifying these endeavors may be, the main task is scarcely approached.

The peace problem cannot be separated from the structure and life of the whole human community, and therefore all isolated measures which try to eliminate war—the oldest and the most firmly entrenched institution of our race—without taking into consideration the general statics and dynamics of social evolution are only quack remedies which may be useful for political propagandists, or may satisfy the craving of sentimentalism, but will never achieve anything serious. This is the reason why, after more than a decade of international propaganda for peace and in spite of the establishment of the League of Nations, the World Court, and similar institutions, the world is more armed than ever, general despair is more accentuated than ever, and the clouds of an approaching world war terrify all who dare to see with their own eyes and hear with their own ears.

In this social and psychological situation I think it will not be entirely useless to discuss in these pages the most important mass currents which we witness at the present time waging war against war, to analyze their underlying theories, to scrutinize their methods, and to ask ourselves which of these approaches could lead to the common ideal of all honest men, which is the elimination of war (because for the present occasion I do not wish to combat the opinions of those war philosophers and prophets who are still convinced that war is an inevitable instrument of progress in the spirit of Heracleitus, Machiavelli, and Hegel). If we examine the peace movements and peace theories of our present time, we shall find that all these movements and theories may be reduced to six distinct types. We have an anarchistic, a liberal, a socialist-communistic, a jural, an imperialistic, and an educational approach to world peace. Let us characterize and criticize these movements and theories as briefly as possible, selecting only their more significant principles and methods.

First, the *anarchistic school*. This is based on the conviction that only heroic action on the part of our individual conscience can eradicate war—a clear-cut, outspoken, categorical refusal to participate in war. This conception is decidedly anarchistic in the sense that it affirms the sovereignty of the individual over the state. And really some of the adherents of this school openly attack the state as the ultimate cause of domination and exploitation, and therefore the real begetter of war. They believe that only the destruction of the historic state, either by violence (as Bakunin and Kropotkin taught) or by refusing taxes and military service (as some Christian sects and Leo Tolstoi preached), can eliminate war as a form of competition

between states which cannot be other than imperialistic. A somewhat milder formulation of this doctrine is the movement of those who, without attacking the state itself, would be satisfied with the refusal of military service, or at least with non-participation in war. All kinds of conscientious objectors—Nazarenes, Mennonites, Quakers, and Gandhists—come under this category, which has been strenuously supported recently by the great name of Albert Einstein.

I do not wish to discuss the violent forms of anarchistic thought, because it is manifest that the violent destruction of the state would be a kind of *medicina peius morbi*, a cure worse than the disease, since it would mean a slaughter on the greatest scale. The more impressive form is that of the conscientious objector. Nobody can refuse admiration to those men who have undertaken great sacrifice, often even of their lives, for their lofty principles. Nor can we deny that there is a logical abstract truth in their argument. For it is obvious that if mankind were to adopt their philosophy, war would immediately cease. However, any critical observer of history and present-day politics will agree with me that such an amount of general heroism is beyond the range of mere humanity, because this great-hearted "ability to die," of which Gandhi speaks as his fundamental cure, will remain the attribute of solitary saints. Furthermore, the world is still full of bellicose tribes and armed nations and military dictatorships which would ruthlessly extirpate such a high-minded movement on the part of a small minority. (It is, by the way, the highest compliment to the English nation that Gandhism could become a mass movement in India. All other imperialistic powers of the world would have crushed a similar movement immediately with prison and gallows.) There is, however, one form of war-resistance which could become victorious, and that is a *general strike of all the workers of the world* in the preparation of war materials and in transportation of anything which is related to war. If Socialism were to be really international and really anti-militaristic, it could stop war. Unfortunately everyone who knows the actual forces of the Labor movement will agree with me that such a prospect is entirely Utopian at the present time. The internationalism of the workers is more verbal than real.

The second approach, the *Liberal school*, still maintains the tradition of the great British free-traders and, with John Bright and Cobden, they are perfectly convinced that the universal elimination of trade barriers would suffice to create a general prosperity, and in connection with this the feeling of international brotherhood, which would make war anachronistic nonsense. In this spirit, even H. G. Wells, though not a free-trader of the classic

pattern, but a man who has flirted a great deal with Socialism, said recently: "On the day when a man, with a ton of goods, can travel from Cardiff to Vladivostok or from Moscow to San Francisco, as he can travel now from San Francisco to New York, without a passport and without a customs examination and without seeing a single battleship on the sea, a single soldier in uniform or a single war plane in the air, the chief structures of a World Pax will exist. And until he can do that the great peace will still be unachieved." Of course, Mr. Wells is perfectly right, and I myself belong to the adherents of an absolutely free trade and regard this issue as one of the most important for peace. Nevertheless, this whole philosophy is too simple, because it is based on the erroneous conception (which we shall find in an even cruder form in the Marxian school of Socialism) that the remodeling of economic conditions alone would lead automatically to peace, whereas the very example of Mr. Wells shows that a great many other conditions must be fulfilled before this journey to Vladivostok from Cardiff could become a possibility.

The third school of pacifistic thought, the *Socialist-Communist*, emphasizes another aspect of economic life which must be radically changed before there can be any hope for a peaceful co-operation between the nations of the world. This is the elimination of misery and wretchedness. As long as the vast majority of mankind is, according to the Marxian doctrine, exploited by a small group of extremely rich capitalists, it is inevitable that the despair and slow starvation of the masses will explode into armed conflict as a result of the cut-throat competition of the imperialistic nations. Therefore, not free trade, but rather a universal plan-economy directed by the proletarian world state is the only real means for the elimination of war. This revolutionary doctrine is, therefore, pacifistic in its ultimate aim because it is based on the belief in the possibility of final harmony between all the nations and races of the world if the artificial antagonisms between them are eradicated. For the present time, however, only western Socialism can be called a pacifistic doctrine, because it maintains that this immense transformation of society can be effected by peaceful and gradual constitutional changes—a very doubtful doctrine, in the face of the English, German, and Austrian experiences with the methods of the Second International. This is the reason why the new major current in Marxian Socialism, the ruling Third or Bolshevik International in Russia, not only ridicules the claims of pacifistic Socialism, but maintains as an almost religious dogma that the communistic transformation of the world can be only the result of bloody civil wars inevitably connected with a final war between the capital-

istic and the communistic countries. In this way the rising sun of proletarian pacifism would involve the greatest international mass murder mankind has ever witnessed. A criticism of it is therefore beyond the aims of this article. But even if such a world state of the proletariat were to be accomplished, either by the peaceful means of the Socialists or the violent revolution of the Communists, and even if a thoroughly equal ratio in foodstuffs and shelter and enjoyments were to be guaranteed for all the workers, it is extremely doubtful whether a one-sided economic revolution alone could insure real peace, because the criticism of Aristotle against the communistic Utopias of Plato and other contemporaries is as true in this connection as it was in the problems of the Greek city-states: "There are crimes of which the motive is want; and for these Phalias [a contemporary communist] expects to find a cure in the equalization of property, which will take away from a man the temptation to be a highwayman because he is hungry or cold. But want is not the sole incentive to crime; men desire to gratify some passion which preys upon them . . . men do not become tyrants in order that they may not suffer cold." So Aristotle thinks that Communism may eliminate petty crimes, but would be no remedy against tyrants, adventurers, and all those who are fighting not for bread for their children, but for luxuries and monopolies. A powerful communistic state may as well exploit a weaker socialistic state as a large capitalistic country a smaller, less developed country, even if they are nominally in the framework of a federation. In this way Soviet Russia exercises an absolute rule over Ukraine and all the other smaller nations inside of the so-called federation. Furthermore, a communistic state would mean such an immense concentrated bureaucratic power that there would always be the imminent danger of the imperialist expansion of such a power to the detriment of weaker elements.

If the anarchists regard the moral aspect as the outstanding problem of pacifism, and if both liberals and socialists consider the economic issue as the all important one, the fourth school now in question, which may be called *jural*, considers the problem as one belonging fundamentally to the field of international law. Since war is ultimately a decision between states, that is, governing bodies exercising sovereign power, many people believe that war could be simply eliminated by a contractual agreement between those sovereign powers. Such an agreement vigorously supported by peace-loving public opinion (and it is assumed that the immense majority of mankind is peace loving and hates war) could immediately put an end to war and so even the present generation could enjoy the millenium of



a perfect peace. This exuberantly hopeful school can be divided into two groups: those whose optimism is quite unlimited, and those who mix some realism with their optimism. The former consists of those who believe in the efficacy of the Kellogg Treaty, the Paris Pact, and think that this solemn renunciation of war as "means of national policy" is substantial enough to guarantee peace. The latter are the uncritical admirers of the League of Nations and the World Court who are confident that these institutions as at present constituted are a sufficient guarantee of peace provided that the statesmen of the world be animated by the right dose of good will and enlightenment. This is perhaps true, but the dose of good will and enlightenment by which these statesmen are to be animated is strictly determined by general standards of culture, by the average morality, and by the ruling interests of a given historical period. Furthermore, as Karl Marx once put it, an idea always collapses when not backed by some powerful interest. As the ruling interests of classes, nations, and races are at the present time hopelessly antagonistic (or so they are believed to be), it is almost sophomoric naïveté to believe that fundamental conflicts which the antagonistic parties believe to be an issue of life and death can be settled by contractual agreements against war without creating an efficient instrument for the solution of the underlying disputes. No such efficient instrument exists at the present time, and *cannot exist at the present state of our civilization*. Although it is very easy to speak of a codification of international law, of a world tribunal, and even of a world parliament backed by an international army, yet it is manifest to any keen thinker that such institutions could work only in a community of nations whose main interests were the same, whose leading moral ideas were analogous, and in which any nation would be willing to renounce all monopolies and privileges not shared equally by the others. What we call world politics shows just the opposite features to such an extent that we can describe world politics as the historical struggle for monopolies and privileges, that is, for unequal participation in power.

These considerations are not a condemnation of the main idea of jural pacifism—meaning the belief in the necessity of an international law exercised by an international tribunal and supported by a sufficient international police force—but it is a protest against the naïve belief that jural agreement not protected by overwhelming common interests and by a generally accepted standard of morality would be enough to extirpate war. Even in our old nation-states, with a homogeneous population, common traditions, and powerful common interests, we need a strong armed force to maintain a

domestic equilibrium, and there are cases in which this solid police force itself is unable to enforce certain laws. How preposterous it is, therefore, to believe that the present world, consisting of different races (speaking different tongues and worshiping different gods), of antagonistic economic systems (from imperialistic capitalism through state socialism to tribal barter economy), of fundamentally divergent governmental methods (varying from direct popular democracy to fascist dictatorship), and the whole based on the exploitation of the overwhelming majority by a small, strong, self-conscious oligarchy; how preposterous it is, I say, to believe that a world like this could really accept and fulfill contractual agreements back of which there would not be even the semblance of real power. The sadly ironical words of Anatole France: *un juge sans des gendarmes serait un pauvre rêveur* (a judge without policemen would be a poor dreamer) describes exactly the present situation of the League of Nations. Amid the bloody struggles going on in China and Manchuria I scarcely have to elaborate on this point to people who have not lost their sense of reality.

In face of the difficulties already mentioned, the two remaining schools of pacifism would advise quite different methods. The fifth, which we called *imperialistic*, revives the memories of some great historical experiences. Its proponents believe that following the traditions of the *Pax Romana* and (with more enlightenment and moral scruples) the work which Napoleon began for the unification of Europe, a new hero of world history may appear some day who will crush with his overwhelming power all the antagonistic, petty, local, selfish, particularistic interests in order to weld a world republic, animated by the spirit of free trade, of national self-determination, of a vast system of local autonomies, of fusion of cultures and religions, of a planned organization of communication, emigration, and immigration. Only such a god-like Cæsar could eradicate the present system of unlimited national sovereignties which makes all peace talk nonsensical. No one will deny the historic beauty of this conception, but at the same time all sober students of history will feel with me that even the mightiest and most enlightened Cæsar would arouse by his work of unification so colossal a wave of resentment, distrust, and suspicion that he would be no more successful than Alexander, the Antonines, and Napoleon.

The last school of pacifism which I mentioned, the *educational*, will say: "You see that all these attempts are futile, because with the present human material our ideas cannot be realized. The majority of mankind is still stupid, egotistic, credulous, without self-restraint, and without a feeling of justice. Therefore, only through an educational activity on the

grandest scale can we achieve world peace." These are the men who advocate a close intellectual co-operation in the League of Nations, who bring together youths of various countries in the same summer camps, who clamor for the revision of history textbooks, who exchange professors and students for the mutual benefit of the various nations, who advocate good-will excursions, and many similar things. I am, of course, enthusiastic about such endeavors, especially if they were carried on on a large scale with a systematic method, and with a great independence from existing governments, which are for the most part still governments of war and imperialism. Yet any realistic observer of our present civilization will agree with me that the type of education which we promote is only a function of existing society. The noblest plans of educators will remain pale and ineffective under an economic system and under governments whose main ambition is not to change the world, but to maintain the *status quo*. This state of affairs would make the work of educators very restricted, even if they were all like Comenius or Pestalozzi, and not graduates of Columbia Teachers' College.

---

After this survey, unfortunately very desultory, of the pacifistic movements, many of my readers will probably say that I have here "debunked" all the proposals for the elimination of war, and therefore leave you in an entirely pessimistic mood. However, this would be an erroneous interpretation of my point of view. On the contrary, I see very hopeful features in many of the theories and movements which I have discussed. I admire the moral ardor of the conscientious objectors, and I firmly believe that only a categorical moral condemnation of war can give mankind sufficient impetus to lead the bitter fight against it. Therefore the work of a true conscientious objector has an absolute value if his action is really the outcome of a true heroism and not the fear of a slacker. Under this qualification his sacrifice will belong to our treasury of eternal moral accomplishments. Even his utter practical failure will be a stone in the building of the future. Also I fully endorse the attitude of the liberals concerning a policy of free trade, without which the international economic difficulties cannot be settled. I am entirely in sympathy with the socialists in their endeavor for the elimination of unearned incomes, and in their conviction that as long as the majority of mankind is in a state of physical and spiritual slow starvation all our talk of permanent peace will be futile. I recognize the value of jural pacifism in its attempt to fix in terms of international law all those relations which are mature enough for such a codification. And finally I thoroughly agree with the pacifist educators in their endeavor to create a new interna-

tional moral and intellectual situation so beautifully expressed by the unique Anglo-Saxon idiom, "world-mindedness," which would mean a combination of good will and intellectual clarity concerning international relations.

Surely all these steps should be taken in order to bring about permanent peace. That against which I was, and still am, arguing is this naïve belief that we can discover a single procedure, a kind of pacific panacea or nostrum for the immediate and complete elimination of war. This is really a childish conception, which is a credit to the moral ardor rather than the intellectual clarity of those who advocate it. The truth is that *pax non fit sed nascitur*, by which I mean that peace cannot be invented, but is rather a continuous growth and a possible logical outcome of a long series of readjustments and re-organizations in the economic, moral, and intellectual framework of our society. This means that world peace can result only from strenuous efforts of many generations—generations which have sufficient intellectual clarity and moral restraint to know that the price of world peace is very high and which are willing to pay this price. There is no magic formula for peace. Peace would mean simply world co-operation and mutual understanding on the largest and most spontaneous scale. Every step which raises popular culture, which enlarges the feeling of moral responsibility, which extirpates extreme wealth and extreme poverty, which opens new roads to the free communication of men and goods, which heightens the level of backward races, which eliminates monopolies and artificial privileges—in a word, every step toward social and international justice is a step toward permanent peace. For only a humanity unified in culture, in morality, and in ideals (though rich in diversities of interpretation and elaboration according to their distinct national geniuses) could develop a common will, without which no efficient international organization is possible. It is absurd to believe that we can stabilize the peace now existing, because what we have is not peace at all, but a continuation of war by other means—a situation ably described by Tacitus: "*Servitutem miserrimam pacem appellat.*"

---

Is this idea of a mankind gradually coalescing in economics, intelligence, and morality a Utopia? I think not. We are seeking for new methods of permanent peace and we forget that world history has shown us quite distinctly the methods by which it may be created. The great multitude of those philosophers and propagandists who are seeking for pacifistic panaceas forget that there are before us colossal practical experiences on the largest scale which show us how war may be eliminated and peace cre-

ated. These experiences are so overwhelming that it seems to me that they are as obvious as the egg with which Columbus confuted the courtiers. There are large territories in the world at the present time which constitute areas of permanent peace within their frontiers. This is the case with many of the old nation states. Peace is so firmly established in England, in France, in Switzerland, in these United States, and in many other countries that it is quite improbable and almost impossible that certain parts of these states should fight other parts. (What still may happen is not a fight between territorial division, but occasional outbursts of class warfare.) Most people will say that this is quite natural, but regarding the situation from a historical point of view I would say that this spectacle is entirely unnatural, almost miraculous, because even a superficial student of history knows that through centuries there was not such a thing as a French, an English, a Swiss, or an American unity. The most common feature of many centuries was a continuous fight of a great number of sovereign or semi-sovereign territories against each other. We know that through the early Middle Ages hundreds and hundreds of little states combated each other with ferocity, knowing nothing about an English, French, or Swiss solidarity. Even in America until after the Civil War it was very doubtful if the new Unity would not be annihilated by the rivalries of individual states still proud of their independence and semi-sovereignty. And yet the drive toward unity and peace was irresistible, and at the present time it is so strong that no hostile territorial divisions are imaginable. How did this miracle come about? Was it through contracts, through international agreements for renunciation of war? No. The jural mechanism was only a consequence of a growing solidarity, of a generally felt necessity for union. In the main it was the work of the growth of trade, of intellectual intercourse, and of moral solidarity. A new common will was created which became aware of the absurdity of local custom barriers, sovereign governing bodies, and individual armies. Men began to feel not in local, but in national terms, and the old territorial divisions became anachronistic obstacles for their economic, intellectual, and moral growth. I cannot go into details, but my thesis, which I could demonstrate fully, is that these old historical methods for the creating of peace are the only possible methods for the future too. The present national states have become, in many parts of the world, as much a nuisance as the old city, feudal, or territorial states. It is true that only the élite of mankind can feel this analogy at the present time. But the drift toward broader and broader integrations of nation states is so overwhelming in economics, science, art, and literature—and even in religion—



that the dogma of unlimited national sovereignty will be challenged more and more violently. Of course, the ruling oligarchies for which national sovereignty is a privilege and a monopoly will resist these currents, but meanwhile the solidarity of all the productive forces will be so powerful that the ruling diplomatic and military group will be unable to maintain the antiquated system. If time is ripe, some future generation may witness a really general international strike of all productive manual and intellectual workers—I hope a peaceful and bloodless strike—for the elimination of national sovereignties and for the creation of a world state. Then the world will be really a unit, with a common will, a common soul, a common parliament, and a small international army for maintaining the world community of free and equal nations.

## Books That Have Annoyed Me—and Some Others

RICHARD ROBERTS

MY instructions from the editorial office were to write an article on recent books that might presumably be "valuable" to ministers and educated laymen. But when is a book valuable? One man's meat is another man's poison. Generally I find that in the long run I get more from books that annoy me than from those that please me. Now and again a book flatters me—when I find some of my own private thoughts corroborated by a pundit; and that probably is bad for me. Sometimes a book like Willard Sperry's *Yes-But* comes along and clears some foggy spaces in my own mind and confirms me in some convictions of my own. For this I am duly grateful, and in this case profoundly grateful. Indeed, the whole book would have been justified to my mind by one timely and penetrating admonition that it contains, namely, that we are in these days thinking too much about religion and too little about God. But the book did leave me a little annoyed as well—why can't I write the English language as Willard Sperry does? Then again there is Hoskyns and Davey's *The Riddle of the New Testament* which, with a great weight of learning, reminds us that while we have apparently solved the critical problem of the New Testament, at least in the main outlines, we have still to face the ultimate problem of the Gospels. How did they come to be written at all? And this should send us back to the study of the Gospels with a new seriousness. However, even this book left me with a little subcutaneous annoyance—it left me with a *problem*. And a problem is a nuisance, especially when there are so many of them. L. P. Jacks says of the Unitarian minister in Smokeover that "without a problem never spake he unto them." I wish some enlightened and trustworthy person would make a few bold affirmations. But I suppose that would itself be a problem to someone else.

\* \* \* \*

Not all the books that annoy me, annoy me the same way. The other day I began to read Wexburg's *Individual Psychology and Sex*. I have been interested in Adler's *Individual Psychology*, because it seems to me to be the most plausible of all the doctrines at present on the psychological market; and as Wexburg's book was well spoken of, I procured it in order to learn what light he had to throw on a dark and tortuous subject. But

after reading awhile, I came upon the sentence, "Immortality is a religious myth." I immediately put the book away, not because it had offended one of my prejudices, but because I had lost confidence in the writer's mind. To me, immortality is not a religious myth. It is a conviction that I have reached in the teeth of a good deal of inward resistance, and in spite of a certain indifference in my own mind about the subject. If I have a feeling about immortality at all, it is less about my own than about the immortality of some other people, whose immortality seems to me not only inherently credible, but necessary, if I am to retain my faith in the final rationality of the Universe. So when the subject is dismissed with a contemptuous gesture, as though it were not worth discussing, I am done with the man who does so. I no longer trust his mind. He evidently has not considered the matter, a matter of some consequence. And how am I to be assured that the whole book is not made up of slap-dash judgments of the same kind?

\* \* \* \*

Another recent book has annoyed me in a somewhat similar fashion. On the strength of some favorable reviews in the British Press, I bought and read Gerald Heard's *The Emergence of Man*. The intention of the book is to tell the story of the human odyssey from the days of the half-men to these present troublous times. The book as a whole does not seem to me to deserve the eulogies it has received. It was interesting enough in its way; but its rating was somewhere between fair and middling. But my particular annoyance with this book was that it contrived to tell the story without so much as mentioning Jesus. It was no accidental omission, for Aknaton, Plato, Buddha, and Asoka are in the book. Evidently Mr. Heard of set purpose meant to ignore Jesus. But what does he hope to gain by that? He actually only gains the contempt of people as intelligent as he, who still think that Jesus has had some significance for the last twenty centuries and that he still has significance for the future of man. If Mr. Heard had told us why he leaves Jesus out of the picture, we should have listened to what he had to say. But to leave Jesus out of a book which purports to include the last two thousand years in its scope and to do so without explanation is an insult to his readers' intelligence.

Mr. Heard has indeed something to say about Christianity. But this is a sample of what he says: "The most distinctive characteristic of primitive Christianity is Apocalypticism . . . . This apocalypticism is a feature that the most searching criticism into New Testament origins only seems to

establish more authentically." Who told him so? The only authority he quotes is Schweitzer. Well, we know our Schweitzer, scholar, musician, saint that he is. But we know also that Schweitzer has had his day as a New Testament critic. What seems to be the growing view is that Apocalypticism in the New Testament was a hangover from inter-testamentary Judaism, from which primitive Christianity in its authentic development, namely, the Pauline-Johannine, increasingly disentangled itself.

\* \* \* \*

Speaking of Apocalypticism brings to mind another book that annoyed me. This was D. H. Lawrence's *Apocalypse*. Here Lawrence, whom we have known as novelist and poet, breaks out in a new place. In this book—his last—he is an expositor of the New Testament. I think that Lawrence should be regarded with great seriousness. Throughout his novels and poems, he is a preacher: and he is preaching what he believes to be a gospel. He was very far from being the pornographer that shallow critics have sometimes supposed him to be, though he had himself somewhat to blame for that. He had looked out upon the world and seen it engulfed in a chaos of perverse and corrupted relationships: and the most tragic confusion of all was that in which the sex-relation had been involved. It became his passionate conviction that the complementary physical intercourse of men and women should be rescued from the pit of triviality and degradation into which it had fallen, and reinstated as the ennobling, mutually fulfilling, mutually creative function it was meant to be. But this was only one aspect of the present task of human rescue. Man must needs achieve a new harmony with his whole universe; and he looked, as he makes clear in *The Plumed Serpent*, to the emergence of a new religion which would lift man to a higher dimension and power of life. But Lawrence had a perverse *daimon* in him; and that is why he can be as annoying as he often is. If there was one way more irritating than any other in which he could state himself, he generally chose it.

In this book he expounds the Book of Revelation. Apocalyptic is a human mood which supervenes on political pessimism; and it was not peculiar to the Jews, though it came to fullest expression among them. They were God's chosen people; and by that token they should be lords of the earth. But they were not. For a long time they had been trodden underfoot by one empire after another. This, however, could not go on forever. God would not continue to tolerate this shameful subjection of His people. But they could see no relief coming along the ordinary course of history. So they conceived the idea that one of these days God would intervene

directly in the affairs of the world and usher in a new time in which His own people would be established in a proud independence and even empire. Out of this came eventually the imagery of the Messiah, the Son of man, who would come on the clouds of heaven, with legions of angels, to deliver Israel and to give it the kingdom, the power and the glory.

This was the atmosphere in which the Gospel emerged: and inevitably much of it clung to the first preaching of the Gospel. When the Gospel stepped out of its original Jewish setting this apocalyptic hope was diffused among the humble folk who constituted the Early Church, the weak, foolish, base things of the world, as St. Paul described them. They were what we should nowadays call the proletariat.

Lawrence's point seems to be that these people appropriated the apocalyptic hope of the Jews and applied it to themselves. The Son of Man would come not to deliver the Jewish nation, but those of the submerged proletariat of the Mediterranean seaboard who had taken the Christian name and were being persecuted for it. The Deliverer would come and destroy their lords and masters and inaugurate a new age, which would be a sort of celestial "dictatorship of the proletariat." *And they shall reign for ever and ever.*

Is there anything in it? I am not sure. Luther says that the book of Revelation had very little of Jesus Christ in it, and many of us have felt that. Anyway, the book should be considered. It is, finally, a philippic against envy and the lust of ascendancy which have in every age poisoned human relationships, and it ends with a powerful plea for a living human "togetherness."

For my own part, I have a sense that apocalyptic was a poison which deflected early Christianity from its true course. I cannot enter into the argument here. But the question raises another in my mind. Suppose we could eliminate all the accidental Judaic, Apocalyptic, Hellenic, and Roman elements which affected early Christianity, could we find the real central distinctive thing in Christianity? The Gospel was not a mere syncretism: there was a novelty at the heart of it. What was that novelty? Somebody should write a book on "The New in the New Testament." Perhaps that would solve for us *The Riddle of the New Testament* which Hoskyns and Davey have posed for us.

\* \* \* \*

Mr. Gerald Heard, of whom I have already spoken, reduces religion to social emotion, and he thinks that the future of the race depends on its ability to cultivate that. But Mr. Julian Huxley thinks that there is more



than that in religion, and that there is a place in life for worship. In his new book, *What Dare I Think?* he tells us the kind of religion we should have; and the important thing about it is that it is a religion without God. Naturally, for Mr. Huxley does not believe in God.

If this particular opinion of Mr. Huxley's is sound, then I am confronted by a puzzle, which is Mr. Huxley's own mind. It is a good mind, though not, I think, as good a mind as he thinks it is. I may be wrong on that point: but it seems to be a fairly safe procedure to infer a man's opinion of his own mind from the confidence with which he states his other opinions. Frankly, I should have more confidence in Mr. Huxley's mind if he had a little less confidence in it. None the less, it is a good mind; and as long as he keeps within his own bailiwick, it generally carries conviction to mine. I sit at his feet thankfully: and I owe him much light. The first half of *What Dare I Think?* has been entirely profitable and increased my debt to him. But just there is my puzzle. It seems to me that whatever power fashioned Mr. Huxley's mind knew what it was about. If I cannot make that inference, there does not seem to be much use in thinking at all; for it does not appear to be safe to draw any inference from any premise. The mind of Mr. Julian Huxley is no accident; for there are others comparable to it. I cannot bring myself to believe that Mr. Julian Huxley's mind is an accident any more than I can believe that (say) a Diesel engine is an accident. Nor does it help much—neither do I suppose that Mr. Huxley would be satisfied to say that his mind, like Topsy, just "grewed." In our ordinary experience, we judge that when an instrument serves a recognizable purpose, there has been an intelligent will at work in the making of it. Why then should I leave Mr. Huxley's mind out of the scope of that judgment? In the teeth of Mr. Huxley's opinion, but because of Mr. Huxley's mind, I still go on believing in God. And I don't think that you can explain religion without God any more than you can explain the tides without the moon.

In another of his books, *Religion Without Revelation*, Mr. Huxley comes very near to believing in God. His argument leads him to infer something that he calls "Sacred Reality," and to set it up as an object of worship. For myself I would as soon worship a graven image: and so, at bottom, would Mr. Huxley. This "Sacred Reality" is a fiction of the brain, if it is not God. I suspect that Mr. Huxley has an "inhibition"; it looks as though he is unwilling to go back on his grandfather. In the same book, he has much to say of the father-complex. I wonder whether he is not suffering from a grandfather-complex.

Mr. Huxley's brother, Aldous, is one of the most brilliant of contemporary writers. But it cannot be maintained that he writes pleasant books. His book of travel, *Jesting Pilate*, is a treasure in every way; and he shows us in it an India which few travelers have reported. But his novels, in spite of their brilliancy, are generally disagreeable. And the latest is not least so. In *Brave New World*, he has given us a picture of the kind of world that science will make of it if it gets its own way. The Earl Russell had already warned us that the kind of world that seemed to loom up in the scientific outlook was a world of robots, operated by a few super-men. And now Mr. Aldous Huxley has given us a moving-picture, as it were, of that world. The robots are there—artificially generated men and women, born capable of one job, like the bees in a hive, and spending the length of their days at it. They are all classified according to their capacity: and they are all subordinated to the great God Production. For the monotonous routine of Production there is compensation in the shape of what is called "Organized Happiness," which seems chiefly to consist of mechanized play and unlimited sensuality. Individuals not so completely robotized as to be incapable of vagaries and heterodoxies of thought are herded together in distant islands lest they should contaminate and unsettle this "brave new world." The most dramatic incident in the book is the introduction of a semi-savage, who still believes in personal freedom, and who, not finding a place to lay his head in this mechanized world, takes his own life in despair. The book is an exercise in the bitterest kind of irony: and it is a warning to mankind of what is ahead of it, if it doesn't keep an eye on its scientists. And I wondered now and again, as I read it, whether Mr. Huxley was not also keeping half an eye on Soviet Russia.

\* \* \* \*

Now that I have reached the province of fiction, I want to speak of another novel of a different kind. So far from annoying me, this particular book greatly stimulated me. Its title is *The Fountain* and its author Charles Morgan. Its time is the last year or so of the war; and its scene Holland. Its chief character is an English army officer interned in Holland, who proposes to use his leisure in the study of the contemplative life with a view, first of all, of writing a book about it, but supremely of achieving that life for himself. But the world breaks in upon his seclusion, and the story is of the action and the interaction of the Englishman with a rural but well-born society of Dutch folk who have themselves some English connections. The "coefficient" character in the book is a woman, born in England, of a Dutch mother and married to a German who is still fight-

ing in the War, but whom she does not love, though she is intensely loyal to him in spirit. But this woman and the Englishman fall in love with one another; and the climax of the story is reached when the German, seriously wounded, returns from the war. The meeting and the conversations of the two soldiers, English and German, who find themselves to be interested in the same subject of the contemplative life, seem to me to be among the best-wrought and powerful passages in recent literature of any kind that I have come across. It kept me thinking for many weeks.

I would like to pass on a quotation from Turgeniev which is made in the course of the conversations between the two soldiers, and is as full of substance as an egg is of meat: "It seems to me that to put oneself in the second place is the whole significance of life." If the ministers who read this sentence are not at once stirred to preach a sermon on it they had better examine themselves. The discussion of the point in the book is worthy of the saying, and that is to say a good deal. Apart from this aspect of the book, it tells a fine and moving story: and its style is admirable.

\* \* \* \*

I have affirmed in another place that I believe literature of the "personal" kind, namely, letters, autobiography, biography and the like, is one of the most profitable studies for the preacher. Of this class of writing, the best thing I have come across for a long time is the two-volume *Men and Memories*, by Sir William Rothenstein. Rothenstein is now Principal of the Royal College of Art in London, and is, besides, himself an artist of great distinction. The first volume of the work appeared a year ago or so, and the second is just out. The period covered is from 1872 to 1922; and, naturally, its chief preoccupation is with artists and their work, though there are few notabilities in any walk of life who do not appear to have crossed Sir William's path during the half-century of which he writes. The two books are richly illustrated by sketches, mainly portraits, by the artist himself, with a few others and from other hands. The volumes would be worth possessing for the sketches alone: Sir William has evidently the supreme gift of seeing what lies back of a man's face and suggesting it in his drawings; and some of the war drawings seem to me to be unique in their tragic beauty. The text will some day become a first-class "source" for the literary and artistic history of the extraordinary generation which began with the nineties. Rothenstein lived at the heart of the world which he describes; and some of the letters which he has included in the book are very illuminating and precious for the student of human culture. But what I feel impelled to say is that the work is itself as true a work of art as any work of

the artist's pencil or brush. I am not sure that the best comment on the book is not one that may be borrowed from the book itself. "Style," says the author, "grows from within; it is intrinsic in all good work: it is the quiet, good manners of art. You know a man by his speech, by his behavior, by his dress; by the same tokens, well-bred painting may be recognized. For the preacher who may read this, I am tempted to quote a passage which he may apply to himself and his sermons: "Creation is intuitive self-surrender, the entering into the thing loved. As the youth with the maid does not think of the miracle of childbirth that may ensue, nor even of the beauty of the maid he clasps to him, but surrenders himself that he may unite, body and spirit, with her body and spirit, so the artist is oblivious of the final picture, and loses himself in active union with the object of his desire. This is the value of the work of art,—it is the supreme surrender of self and at the same time an act of masculine virility." What a sermon it would be that was at once "a supreme surrender of self" and "an act of masculine virility"!

\* \* \* \*

I take it that that extraordinary and unhappy record, *Father and Son*, is known to the readers of this journal. Not so long ago the son, Sir Edmund Gosse, followed his father into the unseen, and now his life has been written by the Honorable Evan Charteris. Mr. Charteris has done his work well. But I confess that the impression of Gosse as a man that the story leaves with me is much the same as that which *Father and Son* left with me long ago. Of Gosse's literary distinction there can, of course, be no question; and there were many admirable traits in him. His generosity to young writers was unflinching; and he would take much trouble to put them in the way of literary success. But the aspirant who came to him for counsel did well not to stint the incense. I cannot help the feeling that Gosse was something of a prig—but I may be wrong. It is impossible, of course, to judge any man fairly whom one has not known in the flesh. *Father and Son* is said to be something of a classic, but I took a dislike to the author, though I was on his side in the conflict; and I may be reading my original dislike into the biography. One thing one would like to have had more light upon—how the fervent evangelicalism of Gosse, which had apparently survived his trouble with his father, came to fade away into apparently complete insignificance in his life.

\* \* \* \*

I only wish to add that no man must take me to be a literary critic. Here is only a record of purely personal impressions.

# Christianity and the Supernatural

J. M. SHAW

**T**HIS paper proceeds upon an assumption which cannot be explicitly defended here, but which we hope the progress of the argument will justify. The assumption is that the idea of the supernatural is vital to religion. In religion man believes himself to be in communion with a great Other outside and above himself, a Beyond Who is also akin, able to do for him exceeding abundantly above what he can ask or think. Apart from this belief religion becomes nothing more than a species of self-deception, a self-painting of the human spirit, "the baseless fabric of a dream." In particular is such a belief or faith vital to Christianity as a revelation of God through facts of history leading up to and culminating in the historical personality of Jesus Christ. What is the supernatural, belief in which is thus vital to religion in general and to the Christian religion in particular?

## I

Traditional theology tended to equate the supernatural with the miraculous in the sense of something which involves a break in the chain of natural law, something which is thus unnatural or contra-natural. It is a view to which the church was led chiefly by way of reaction to the development of scientific thinking with its formulation of the principle that everything which happened in nature must be explained in terms of law, uniform law. The religious mind, apprehensive lest God should thus be excluded from direct action in his world, urged that room must be left for divine intervention. And the evidence of the divine activity was found in miraculous or supernatural interventions or interferences with the order of nature or of history, in facts which could not be explained by natural law. Thus there arose a dualism or antithesis between the "natural" and the "supernatural," the "natural" being nature viewed as working apart from or without God, and the "supernatural" as God working without or contrary to nature. On such a view the criterion of the supernatural was discontinuity in the sequence of natural causation. Whatever could be referred to "nature" or "the natural order" was supposed to be explained by law without reference to God's presence and working; while contrariwise the evidence of God's presence and working, the evidence of the "supernatural," was found only in phenomena which could not be accounted for by the natural order and were looked upon as miraculous



intrusions into or interferences with the natural order, contrary to nature and natural law. On such a way of thinking, it is evident, God and the supernatural tend to be reduced to a provisional hypothesis which becomes less and less necessary the more the reign of natural law is extended. Until in the progress of knowledge a point may be conceived as being reached where, as Comte put it, "science will finally conduct God to the frontier and bow him out with thanks for his provisional services."

Such a representation, however, involves the cutting of the unity of the universe in two in a way to which neither religion nor science can long consent. It amounts to the positing of two worlds over against each other, a lower and a higher, a "natural" and a "supernatural." The lower or "natural" world runs by its own laws and from it the direct action of God is excluded. The higher or "supernatural" world is the world where God is and out of which he makes occasional incursions into the lower world, the world of law. It is a representation which is rooted in a mechanical view of the universe which is now both scientifically and philosophically obsolete. The system of law which we call "nature" or "the natural order," is not a rigid closed mechanical system of matter and force in the way that earlier science tended to represent it—a system owing its origin at the first, it may be, to divine creative power but now a self-controlled, self-running system bound together by the iron bands of natural law. If it were so, the action of the supernatural would be conceived of as an intrusion of God into the natural system; disturbing its order and interfering with its stability. But nature, as present-day scientific and philosophic thought is increasingly emphasizing, is a living, moving, growing organism, existing only in a spiritual context and controlled and energized for spiritual ends. From this spiritual reference science may and does for its own purpose abstract, and speaks of the world as being "governed by law" or "under the reign of law." But this is not strictly exact or accurate thinking. Law is not an entity or self-acting force or thing. It has of itself no governing or controlling power. It is simply a formula descriptive of nature's observed method of behavior or procedure, a term expressing the observed regularity or uniformity of nature's sequences. It tells us that, so far as man's observation has gone, certain phenomena do invariably follow other phenomena. As Huxley himself acknowledged: "Law means simply a rule which we have always found to hold good and which we expect always will hold good" (*Collected Essays*, Vol. I, p. 193). The so-called "laws of nature" as formulated by science accordingly are not external forces which cause sequences. They are simply descriptive

generalizations. In the words of Professor J. Arthur Thomson (*The System of Animate Nature*, p. 9), they are "formulae summing up regularities of recurrence," formulae descriptive of nature's observed regular or uniform sequences.

Such a uniformity or regularity in nature's sequences is not only the condition and assumption of science; it is the very condition of rational life in all its manifestations. Without it life would be chaos; no intelligent rational intercourse on our part with nature or with one another would be possible. One could not intelligently forecast results, nor set about the accomplishment of orderly purposes. The very order of the world, accordingly—the "reign of law" or the "uniformity of nature," as it is called by science—is, properly conceived, not a limitation or imprisonment of free rational action, as it would be were it but the operation of an external mechanical necessity. Rather is it a very condition of human freedom, the basal substructure, shall we not say, of a Heavenly Father's working for the sake of rational and spiritual ends with his children.

So far as science is concerned, then, we are confronted simply with regular sequences and with nothing more. This the more recent developments of scientific thinking are very significantly emphasizing, leading to the weakening of the hold on the mind of the scientist of the idea of law in so far as this suggests anything of rigid mechanical necessity. Such an idea—the idea of intrinsic inflexible necessity in a mechanical sense—is, it is recognized, as W. R. Matthews puts it, "an inference drawn illegitimately from the more modest postulates and observations of science" (*God in Christian Thought and Experience*, p. 221). It is indeed a gratuitous and unwarranted hypothesis introduced into scientific thinking under the influence of unscientific materialistic or semi-materialistic dogmatic assumptions.

## II

This system of law, however, which we speak of as "nature," or "the natural order," is not all on one level. There is an ascending series of grades or levels. In Boutroux's phrase, there is a "hierarchy of laws." Law is everywhere in the sense of regularity or uniformity of behavior. But the laws, or regularities of behavior, operating in the organic sphere are different from those operating in the inorganic sphere; and those in the conscious and self-conscious spheres different from those in the organic and inorganic. From the point of view of the lower order, the actions of the higher order or orders may appear unnatural or contra-natural, "con-

trary to nature" (*contra naturam*). But as Augustine long ago pointed out, this means not that they are really contrary to nature but only contrary to nature in the sense of above so far as this is known at the lower level (*non contra naturam sed contra quam est nota natura*, *De Civ. Dei* XXI, 8). They would be "contrary to nature" only if the laws of the lower order were assumed to be final and ultimate for the whole system of nature, instead of being part of a larger whole, means to ends beyond themselves.

That this whole system of law which we call nature, with its different orders or levels, is not either as a whole or in any of its parts a rigid closed mechanical system, exclusive of freedom, but is rather the instrument and servant of personality, susceptible to the ends of personal life and controllable or directable accordingly—of this we have first-hand knowledge in our own experience. As Carlyle observed in *Sartor Resartus*, the practical proof of this subjection of the system of nature to ends of personality is that I can freely stretch forth my hand. The hand which I stretch forth is as much a part of nature and as entirely subject to its laws, to the law of gravitation among others, as rocks or stones or trees. And yet I freely stretch it out. The system of laws which we speak of as our bodies, that is to say, we utilize freely for personal ends. It is not that these laws to which our bodies as a part of nature are subject are violated or contravened by being thus made the instrument of personal intelligence and will. So far from that, the very condition of our being able to use them as the instrument of our will is, as we have already indicated, that they are stable or uniform, that they can be depended on in the sense that the same conditions invariably or uniformly produce the same results. No: it is rather that the working of these laws is taken up and controlled or utilized so as to fulfill the purposes of a higher and larger law. And the more we learn or discover of the laws of nature the more controllable or susceptible nature becomes to the ends of personal will. Each new law of nature, indeed, becomes, when discovered, a new instrument of personality, an instrument for the development in new ways of helpful intercourse between persons, and as such a new possibility for man's causing things to happen in a world of law which apart from his action or intervention never would have happened.

Now if this is so, if man is thus able and more and more able with his advancing knowledge of nature's laws to co-ordinate and utilize these laws for ends of personal worth or value, what shall we say of God who has all the laws of the universe in his hand for the realization of ends of moral and spiritual worth with his children? To believe in a living God, a God

who is perpetually present and perpetually working in his universe for the accomplishment of moral and spiritual purposes, a God who is immanent in all the activities of the world but who also transcends all the known order of the world, so that nature or the natural order does not exhaust his activity—this is to believe in the supernatural and in the possibility of new beginnings in the spheres of nature and of grace, beginnings that cannot be accounted for by their known natural antecedents. As Karl Barth puts it: "Whoso says God," such a God, "says miracle" (*Der Römerbrief*, p. 96).

Such new beginnings or "emergents" we have seen appearing at various stages of the evolutionary process—new beginnings which are more than the sum of all their antecedents and point to the creative immanence of the supernatural in the natural order. The whole story of evolution is a record of the successive emergences of the unprecedented—life, consciousness and self-consciousness. Such emergence of new and higher worths or values—values which are not reducible to anything lower in the scale than themselves—is altogether consistent with continuity of process. These values may be called "supernatural" relatively to what stands below them, but they are not miraculous in the sense of being "contrary to nature" or a breach of natural law. Now the culminating instance of the emergence of such new values within continuity of process we have in the personality of Jesus, a new "emergent" in human life and history. His was a life lived as no other human life in normal relations with the living God and in harmony with his purposes—a life controlled as no other by faith in God and love to man. And in the case of such a unique moral and spiritual character, constituting a new beginning in human history, we might antecedently expect from the analogy of nature at the lower levels that God, the living God, immanent in the world but always more than it, over and above it (*super*), would be able to manifest his power and his purposes through him in new and unprecedented ways. As it has been put: "As with the appearance of man there were introduced new powers and properties unimaginable from the animal point of view and therefore from that point of view seemingly supernatural, so with the appearance of Christ we ought to expect new powers and properties unimaginable from the human point of view and therefore to us seemingly supernatural, that is to say, above our nature" (Le Conte, *Evolution in Relation to Religious Thought*, p. 362).

This is how the New Testament itself represents the case. The so-called "miracles" of Jesus are referred to as his "works"—or rather according to his own representation as the "works" of God through him—

works of super-ordinary character evoked and made possible by his super-ordinary faith in and obedience to God. The creative energy of God was released through him in a new and unique way because of his unique commitment of himself in faith and love to the Father's purposes. A like power, he indicated, was open to all who have a like faith, for he put the case in terms of a general principle or truth when he said: "All things are possible to him that believeth" (Mark 9. 23 and parallels). He meant that the relationship to God established by a complete faith invests us with the very power of God himself. Says D. S. Cairns in *The Faith that Rebels*: "The roots of his (Jesus') unique power over nature lie in his unique spiritual character; not in his metaphysical divinity, but in his perfect humanity. . . . The gospel theory of the 'miracles' of Jesus is that they are the answers of God to the prayers of the Ideal Son, the Man who is the supreme instance in history of Faith, Hope, and Love: and they say with unambiguous plainness that that ideal Man invited his disciples to similar enterprises of faith, encouraging them to believe that in proportion to their faith would be the manifestation of God's order, the revelation of man's life as God meant it to be" (pp. 84-5).

### III

It is in its emphasis on the supernatural in this sense as vital to the Christian religion that Barth's distinctive message to his age consists. His theology he speaks of as a "theology of correction." It is corrective above all of the over-emphasis on the divine immanence which he holds characterizes modern liberal thinking. Barth, indeed, by way of reaction to immanent theology, insists over-vigorously on the divine transcendence. He removes God as "the wholly (or, quite) Other" (*das Ganz Andere*) so far from nature and history that he tends to reintroduce in a new form the old deistic dualism or antithesis between the natural and the supernatural. He has no use for "natural theology" and the old theistic arguments which argued "from nature up to nature's God." In history, too, he finds no revelation of God. "History in general," he says, "is not revelation." "Who-so says history says non-revelation." Even in human experience he tends to find no place for divine revelation. Revelation can come only from outside and above the sphere of human life. God, so far as nature and history and human experience go, is the hidden God, the *Deus absconditus* of Luther, who becomes the *Deus revelatus* only in Christ and above all in his resurrection, which is described as "a vertical miracle," the breaking through of eternity into time.



When thinking of the Barthian emphasis on the idea of divine transcendence we should keep in mind, indeed, Emil Br  nner's warning, which he considers "important" for a proper understanding of the Barthian position, that "we are treating of an epistemological but not a cosmological transcendence." "We hold, that is to say," he explains, "that God cannot be known by his active presence in the world. His presence in nature and history is not denied, but it is regarded as hidden, so that what God is is not revealed" (*The Theology of Crisis*, p. 28, footnote). In particular in this epistemological reference it should be remembered that what Barth and the Barthians have in view is the kind of knowledge of God that sinful men have apart from Jesus Christ, and the revelation that they have through him—a revelation made in relation to a situation caused by sin. The dualism emphasized by Barthians is a dualism which is ethical in its character, having reference to the separation between man and God involved in sin.

Modern liberal theology, the Barthians maintain, has so emphasized the immanence of God and the divinity of man as to obliterate this separation. Man indeed, they recognize, has been made in the image of God, but in sinning he has revolted against God and introduced a great discontinuity into God's universe. Through sin man has become a fallen and broken creature whose misery and need far exceed his glory. So Barth will have nothing to do with the modern immanentist emphasis on the divinity of man and the essential goodness of human nature. The gospel, he says, is "no tidings and instructions about the divinity and deification of man but a message about a God who is quite Other" (*Romans*, p. 4). Between man and God, therefore, there is a great gulf fixed. There is no way from man to God. If the two are to meet, it is not by man's rising to God, but by God's coming down to man. This is what makes the gospel a gospel, a message of good news. It is the message of what God has done and done in his grace for sinful man. In the words of Br  nner, who is the systematic theologian of the Barthian school, "Salvation comes from the beyond; it comes not from but into history, not from but into human reality, which in itself cannot produce but only long for it." "Hence," he says, "the New Testament, in describing what was given through Jesus Christ, uses only such words as express discontinuity with all that man has apart from Christ. Darkness—light, death—life, perdition—salvation, judgment—grace, guilt—forgiveness, sin—redemption. . . . This discontinuity is the stumbling-block, the kernel of the gospel; it is the one thing that the New Testament wants to say. And he who thinks away

this discontinuity and these irreconcilable antitheses, thinks away the gospel from the New Testament" (*The Word and the World*, p. 48). As Barth himself puts it, man's salvation is not something that comes by evolution or inevitable progress from below upwards. It is not something that can be attained by human effort but something that God alone can accomplish. It is the result of a divine *ingressio*, a breaking into the world of something beyond and above, the Transcendent or Supernatural.

The question of the supernatural which is thus vital to the Christian religion is—it should be emphasized—not simply a question as to the character of certain events in the past. It is the question of belief in a living God, transcendent over all, yet actively at work in the present for the realization of moral and spiritual ends with his children. And as Barth points out, we have the best assurance of this in such experiences as the experience of divine forgiveness. "The highest expression of the *totaliter* which the Bible utters is the teaching of the forgiveness of sins" (*The Word of God and the Word of Man*, p. 92). There in our own lives we have that which neither nature nor human nature in and by themselves can explain. We have a change in our relation to God which can only be accounted for by God's transcendent supernatural action, by the living God entering with living creative power into the life of man, blotting out the past, putting his sinful children right with himself and thereby making all things new. In this remedial redemptive entrance of God in his grace into the moral order which binds cause and effect together, bringing about a change in our relation to himself and providing us with a new start, we have the supernatural not in the distant past but in the immediate present. This provides us with our best look at the supernatural, and we do well to start our thinking about the matter here, for in such an experience the supernatural abides.

# Antecedents of the Great Depression

ROCKWELL D. HUNT

THE often-quoted maxim of that broad-visioned historian, Thomas Arnold of Rugby, "The harvest of the past should be brought home for the use of the present," is still a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptance. In a time like the present the truth expressed by Davis Dewey in the Preface to his *Financial History of the United States* likewise has special applicability: "It is easy in the light of accumulated experience to pass judgment on the errors of the past, but historical study, in my opinion, is more fruitful if the reader endeavors to interpret the past in accordance with the experience which was available at the time the occurrences took place."

What we have come to refer to as the present depression is a highly complex phenomenon. It cannot be a matter of surprise, therefore, that its antecedents, conditions precedent, and effective causes were many and exceedingly far-reaching. But if the phenomenon is complex in its essential character, it becomes steadily more complex the longer it remains an unsolved problem. No prescription of an adequate remedy for the dislocation of industry, for the disorder of the entire economic system, is to be thought of in the absence of a careful, objective diagnosis, and the longer the diagnosis is lacking the more threatening become the symptoms of a general breakdown.

In considering the antecedents of any significant present phenomenon a first postulate to be remembered is the continuity of history. While the great sweep of historical evolution—the great on-moving current of universal history—unquestionably includes revolutionary movements of greater or lesser volume and force, there can be no such thing as a complete break with the past: we are because of what was. There is an ever-present blending of the past and the present. Furthermore, there can be no questioning of the general proposition that historical evolution tends ever to move from the simple to the complex, from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous.

A second postulate is seen in the assumption of the existence of causal relationships in the course of human events. Failing this, King Hazard would indeed be ruler, reason itself would be baffled, conscious progress impossible.

We are confronted then with the tragically familiar depression, which we try to think of in its local setting, or as a national crisis, but which—

candor compels us to admit—has settled upon humanity as a world-wide phenomenon, a great pall not without dark forebodings for the future.

Nothing is now clearer than that the crisis of 1929-32 had its beginning well before the stock crash in October, 1929. While in America we were enjoying unprecedented prosperity and our leaders extolling the "New Era," European nations were face to face with problems of the most acute and critical character. Such danger signals as were hoisted by sober-thinking American economists were airily disregarded like the utterances of prophets not without honor save in their own country. Even the grave condition of the farmer during several years failed to halt the wild march straight toward the precipice.

The crisis, long in preparing, was finally precipitated. The United States, having succeeded in artificially maintaining for a time a prosperity not approached by any other nation, plunged into the depths of a depression which has proved relatively more devastating and disastrous than that of other nations.

All past ages have been rified to bring us our moment of history. Still we must essay the difficult task of selecting out those forces and factors which have contributed most significantly to the present economic situation. Since only those antecedents that have relevancy are of interest, we cannot wisely attempt any sharp distinction between antecedents and causes.

Nevertheless it must be patent to any intelligent person that the antecedents of such a world phenomenon as we are considering are not confined to the purely economic realm. To illustrate, it is safe to say that modern capitalism, coupled as it is with individualism and nationalism, derived certain of its leading characteristics to no small extent from the teachings inherent in the Protestant Reformation, particularly those of John Knox, which emphasized the doctrine of the salvation of the individual by faith and helped lay the foundation for the principle of *laissez faire*. Take an illustration from philosophy. The mechanistic materialism of our day owes its genesis in considerable degree to the philosophic doctrines of positivism, evolutionary naturalism, and economic determinism. Add to these the utilitarianism of Mill, the pragmatism of James, and the instrumentalism of Dewey, and the conclusion that there are important philosophical presuppositions of economics becomes irresistible. Further illustrations might readily be drawn from the realms of politics and ethics.

Because of the complexity of the situation, involving factors drawn from widely separated sources, antecedents and causes might consistently be considered under various schemes of classification. Thus there are the

remote, the mediate, and the immediate; or there are the proximate and the ultimate. Some are direct, others indirect; again, some are primary, others secondary; or, some are underlying causes, others surface phenomena. From the standpoint of geography some are local, others nation-wide, others yet international; genetically some are purely economic, others political, still others ethical and religious. Naturally these are overlapping, and interdependent. Obviously it is impossible to follow any such array of classifications here.

Perhaps I cannot do better than to use as my present basis of classification, which cannot claim completeness or adequacy, the simple expedient of negatives and positives; with some rhetorical license I venture to call the antecedents from which descended the great depression the social sins of omission and of commission. Even these, we must be cautioned, are not to be regarded as wholly self-exclusive; and there is something very positive about certain negative antecedents.

Any reasonable interpretation or just appraisal of the present depression must have due regard to the course of evolution of industrial society. It is necessary to go back farther than the period of the beginnings of the Industrial Revolution. The monumental work of Adam Smith appeared before the Industrial Revolution had got fairly under way; therefore, as Professor Rist has pointed out, Smith cannot be "regarded as the herald of dawning imperialism." Modern capitalism, however, in its earlier manifestations dates its beginnings contemporaneously with the beginnings of modern history, which are definitely associated with the fall of Constantinople, the discovery of America, and the crystallization of national life. And the whole course of modern capitalism supplies the conditioning background, the significant antecedents of the contemporary depression.

Professor Seligman has defined capitalism (which, by the way, President Butler calls a misnomer and a term of reproach) as "that form of economic life which places in the hands of a specific class the control of every stage in the process of production from the supply of the raw material to the sale of the finished product on the market." Among its chief characteristics are round-about production, the displacement of human exertion by natural forces, mass production, integration, standardization. Under it the laborer loses personal contact with the employer, the workman is divorced from the means of production, and there are strong tendencies toward combination, consolidation, concentration. Its dominating spirit embraces the elements of individualism, the motive of private profits, and



the rôle of exact calculation as a device for the attainment of desired results.

It is one thing to define and describe capitalism, and quite another to appraise it on the basis of social utility, and still another to predict its future. It is easy to bring indictment against the capitalistic system—the major activity of many a socialist and other variety of revolutionary has therein consisted. The waste and cruelty of competition, the lack of co-ordination, the drab uniformity resulting from mass production and standardization, the excessive human costs consequent on relatively low wages and unsatisfactory employment conditions, the disparity of income and of accumulated wealth as between classes—these are dinned into our ears in season and out of season. And assuredly a period of serious depression is a wide-open season for the outdoor and indoor sport of baiting the capitalist!

On the other hand, what we owe to capitalism is a subject that is also due for an important chapter in the book of industrial progress. Competition is pictured as a saving force that has brought about reduced costs, the huge machine has relieved the worker and become the strong-armed servant of all, the rising tide of wealth has given America, chief exemplar of capitalism, hitherto unknown standards of living and advances in human progress. The most signal advance yet achieved in the economic life of mankind has been achieved with unprecedented swiftness under the modern capitalistic regime. For the triennium ending in 1929, the "new capitalism" was being heralded abroad and there were pleasing prospects of permanent prosperity: for the succeeding triennium ending in 1932, we witness an amazing revulsion of feeling, following hard upon an incredible change of conditions, giving rise to the most gloomy forebodings and even the prophecy of despair. How can these things be? Does capitalism represent the "most signal advance yet made in economic life"? Should the system in its essence be retained, while lopping off the mere excrescences that have afflicted it? Or is it inherently evil, to be henceforth discarded and rejected of men? Fortunately it is not incumbent on me to venture unconditional answers to these searching queries. It cannot be amiss, however, to admit that modern capitalism, as we have known it in the western world, is perhaps on trial for its life. It would seem that Richard T. Ely was right, a number of years ago, in stating in his popular textbook: "Whether it is desirable, whether in the long run it will be possible, to maintain a competitive as distinguished from a socialistic regime of industrial society, may be said to be the supreme economic problem of the twentieth century."

At length the setting has been laid for passing in review the most significant specific antecedents and salient causes of the devastating depression. Brevity compels somewhat categorical expressions, though any spirit of dogmatism is disavowed. Except as otherwise specifically indicated the discussion will refer more particularly to American conditions, though, to be sure, much of it may readily be applied also to other lands and peoples.

On the negative, or passive, side of the account, I present the following, not as a complete list of entries but nevertheless comprising the larger items; and their significance is not to be thought of as by any means diminished because of their negative character.

1. *Disappearance of the frontier.* Pioneers facing westward were our truest Americans. It was the westward march that brought new opportunities, made American life fluid, and developed a stalwart individualism that must ever be regarded one of the noblest assets in our distinctive civilization. The Westerner was compelled to face his own problems, depend on immediate self-help, and carve out his own destiny. But when the Pacific was reached, when steam and electricity were harnessed and driven across desert and mountain, and teeming population filled the great open spaces, the frontier disappeared; the West could no longer afford the needed relief to the East. The type of individualism that in our pioneer fathers was a sterling virtue has faded and with the frontier has disappeared forever.

2. *The business cycle.* Whether or not it is inherent in the capitalistic system, the so-called business cycle is viewed as a potent fact, and unfortunately—as I think—is regarded by many as inevitable. Must it forever, like the ebbing and flowing of the tide or the succession of the seasons, keep up its calamitous rhythm of recovery (expansion), prosperity (boom), crisis (contraction), depression (liquidation)? Because human nature changes but slowly, must human intelligence stand forever baffled by a phenomenon induced by human errancy? I conceive it to be an indication of weakness, savoring of the philosophy of defeatism, for one to argue that because there have been a dozen depressions in the nineteenth century there will likewise be another dozen in the twentieth. I hold, on the other hand, that the depression, being man-made and not the result of purely natural forces, is subject to the control of human will and human intelligence, of which there is ample to-day if only it can be rightly mobilized and directed. Meanwhile there can be no gainsaying the importance of the business cycle as one of the most powerful antecedents of the present depression.

3. *Lack of over-all planning.* In August, 1931, there appeared in the

official organ of the National Economic League a summary of the report of a special committee on the causes of the present economic depression: in the list of causes first place was given to "Lack of over-all planning and maladjustment between production and consumption." It should by now be thoroughly demonstrated that, whatever changes may come in our economic structure, we have in America been inexcusably lacking in large, co-ordinated central planning and that some sort of over-all planning will be, henceforth, absolutely indispensable. There is no more telling count in the current indictment of capitalism than the charge that, to employ a phrase from Norman Thomas, "The whole system is planless and extremely chaotic." "Maladjustment" is writ large across the economic horizon. Visualize, if you can, the monstrous maladjustment all about you, when—to cite but a single instance—a miller reports that our flour mills could turn out the year's supply of flour in ninety days! With our lack of central planning and with the pall of depression settling about us, it is little wonder that confusion of thought has changed to bewilderment, fast sinking into despair and a sense of utter futility.

4. *Dearth of statesman-like leadership.* This has been so obvious that little further comment is necessary here. It is a melancholy truth that economic statesmanship of commanding sort has been conspicuously absent during recent decades, whether we look toward public officials in high places, or the captains in industry itself, or the professional economists. It may be replied that this factor is a concomitant rather than an antecedent of the depression, and certain it is that it has been a pronounced characteristic of the three trying years 1929-32; but it remains true that the engulfing fears and follies of depression might have been prevented or mitigated by statesmanlike wisdom in the days of prosperity.

5. *The World War.* It must not be overlooked that a primary cause of serious magnitude was the catastrophe of the World War. For most of the world it should not have been difficult to predict economic prostration. By this war the world—as Carlyle once said of the Thirty Years War for Europe—has been brayed as in a mortar. Ten million young men were sacrificed, inconceivable amounts of wealth wasted, deep national and political animosities were engendered: at such a time, under such conditions the rebuilding of civilization was indeed a task for the gods. America has survived other periods of depression, but the present is unique in the degree of its international origin and character. Nor was any previous crisis accompanied by any such huge experiment in practical communism anywhere in the world as that inviting constant comparison in Soviet Russia.

6. *Corruption and inefficiency in government and in business.* This factor has been an antecedent of very considerable magnitude, though one would not say it is unique in this particular depression. Locally and in the nation at large we have been witnessing a succession of episodes, involving fraud, defalcation, grand theft, racketeering, bank failures, malfeasance in office, and the like, which not only have brought loss and sorrow to thousands of innocent victims but, what is socially worse, have filled neighbors and citizens with discouragement and with a haunting lack of confidence that begets downright pessimism and irresponsibility. In this there is little to choose between private business and public office—corruption and inefficiency are not confined to the one or the other. Nevertheless both are a reproach to business, and each places a heavy strain upon democracy. In a free country political indifference and depravity among the masses is scarcely less banal than the deliberate exploitation of the many by the few for the sake of paltry dollars.

7. *Lack of moral vitality.* Closely related to the last-mentioned item, and even more far-reaching in scope and influence, has been the dearth of dependable moral sentiment among multitudes of our people. Alarmingly numerous have been the advanced cases of "sclerosis of conscience." "The great trouble," points out a recent writer, "is not with our economic system but with our moral ideas, standards, and conduct of the people, and that it is the moral conduct rather than the system that needs revision. . . . Without such a change, a moral change, other changes in the machinery or rules of business that may seem desirable will probably not be supported and not be effective, and with such a change great improvements could be wrought with but little change in the system." Many a moral ideal has been sacrificed on the pagan altar of high-powered salesmanship, or clever but untruthful advertising, and by a thousand ingenious but nefarious devices for getting something for nothing. Only recently American surety companies took cognizance of the sharp drop in the business honesty curve; and because of reports of abnormal losses on fidelity bonds the rate of coverage was advanced approximately 10 per cent—the first time fidelity insurance rates had been revised—we are told—in twenty-three years.

Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,  
Where wealth accumulates, and men decay.

8. *Absence of religious motivation.* Too little heed has been paid to the proposition that no solution for unemployment or industrial maladjustment will prove adequate or permanent that is not conformable to the prin-

ciples and practices of the best Christian ethics. In the absence of religious sanctions and spiritual mandates no dynamic has yet been discovered that will sustain high moral conduct among the people either in public life or in private thinking. Rufus Jones has aptly said, "A pyramid standing on its apex is hardly more unstable than a civilization that has lost the poise and balance of well-grounded faith in spiritual realities." Like a true prophet he concludes, "Our difficulty to-day is within ourselves. We must build our own souls before we can rebuild our world. All victories are won within, in the soul, before they are achieved in the world outside."

I have thus passed in rapid review eight antecedents and causes of the present depression, which, for most part, may be regarded, though somewhat arbitrarily, as negative or passive factors, but by no means negligible. In pointing out defects there is need always to be on guard against the danger of overstatement; but the mistakes committed in America with reference to these eight factors are in general likened unto social sins of omission.

Next I shall set forth other antecedents and causes, which may be regarded as of more directly positive or active character. Insofar as they reveal mistakes of more overt character these may be likened unto social sins of commission. The list lays no claim to being complete; but nevertheless it is believed the major factors have been included.

1. *Concentration in industry.* This is one of the most familiar of all recent economic phenomena. With a concentration in industry has come concentration in wealth and income. One or two familiar illustrations will suffice. In 1928 fifty persons in the United States reported incomes in excess of one million dollars each; in 1921 less than 1 per cent of all the people owned approximately 25 per cent of all the wealth, while about one fifth of the people owned more than three fourths of the wealth. Such disparity of wealth and of income of necessity raises the question of the social justice of any system in which it is possible. It is chargeable with being a major cause of present unemployment with its prolific train of evils.

2. *Over-speculation, excessive expansion of credit.* Over-extension of credit and unwarranted speculation have constituted jointly an important immediate cause of virtually every financial crisis and a forerunner of every severe depression. The procedure has been graphically depicted by Professor S. S. Huebner: "During the period of prosperity a vast amount of speculative error accumulates backed up by credit. The barrel of TNT is



there, ready to explode. It merely requires some match to set off the explosion, and this disturbs the speculative mind throughout the nations. But we must not emphasize the match and forget the explosive material itself." The speculative mania that preceded the present depression ran true to form, only it surpassed its predecessors. Thousands upon thousands of novices were led to dabble in stocks—many felt flattered momentarily at being taken for insiders. Prices of stocks climbed to absurd and dizzy heights, and the severity of the crash when it came was augmented by the amazing orgy of installment buying. American extravagance, which creates abnormal demand for luxuries at inflated prices, withdrawing money and legitimate credit from normal commodity purchases and stimulating the anti-economic practices of gambling, stalks arrogantly into the very foreground of the picture of the antecedents of the depression.

3. *Over-production (or under-consumption)*. Over-production has been perhaps the most generally assigned cause or explanation of industrial crises. Referring to the present situation, it is matter of common knowledge that recent technological changes have brought at least temporary excess capacity in many if not most important lines. But we have been taught that the wants of man are indefinitely expansible, or insatiable, from which it follows there can be no general over-production of good things. Therefore it is more accurate to view the other side of the shield and find there the word under-consumption—both refer to the lack of balance between production and consumption. If there can be no general over-production, there is at least under-consumption resulting from excessive savings from profits by corporations or from inability to purchase what is produced at the prices demanded. This in turn points to the probability of a maladjustment of income, resulting in serious lack of purchasing power among masses of people.

4. *The tariff wall*. The tariff question has become increasingly important *pari passu* with the increasing interdependence of nations. The paradox of the ever-mounting tariff walls tending to separate nation from nation whose mutual interests demand trade relations reveals a singular lack of co-ordination. It is a piece of grim humor that a debtor nation should be inhibited from making payment to the creditor nation in goods—it has no other means of paying!—because the creditor erects tariff barriers around itself that cannot be surmounted. Furthermore it is charged that recent American tariffs have on the whole been framed to afford chief protection to industries needing it least and not to the farmer class, whose basic industry has needed it most of all. In the matter of foreign trade is it

not clear we have now arrived at a new stage in the Industrial Revolution? The greatest of all oceans has been reached, but we have not yet awakened to the pregnant fact that the world's economic frontier is also really disappearing.

5. *Depressed agriculture.* A condition precedent of the widespread depression has been the distress of the farmer, a cankerous condition that for years has been eating away the very foundations of industry almost unperceived, or at least unheeded. The general business structure could not continue healthy while the farm problem remained unsolved, for the problem of the farmer is itself one of the greatest business problems. International prices of our principal crops—wheat and cotton—have fallen below general costs of production. Domestic prices of most other important crops have followed in their train. I cannot doubt that the distress of the American farmer class has been a significant factor in causing our general depression; and I agree with Dean Donham that "aside from the rehabilitation of our credit structure there is no more important problem which we face than the stabilization of the farmers."

6. *War debts: reparations.* Melancholy indeed has been the legacy of the war debts and the unbalanced account styled "reparations." Instead of bringing peace they have brought strife; instead of wealth, illth; instead of balance, disequilibrium. The purchasing power of Europe has been sadly reduced; the enormous burden has played havoc with international markets; in every situation in every land there has gone stalking about, either in the foreground or the background, but never wholly absent, that hideous specter, reparations. The economic reconstruction of the world has long waited upon a definitive settlement of the momentous question of the war debts. Only now have we seemed to see light on the horizon.

7. *Banking and finance: unstable money.* A complex of financial and banking situations that expanded geometrically commercial bank credit without effectuating a corresponding social responsibility for its wise use constituted a subtle but widely pervasive factor antecedent to the depression. Intimately related to this was the uneconomic and inequitable distribution of the world's monetary gold, with the prospect of an approaching scarcity of new gold, followed by a drop in the price of silver to unheard-of levels and the spectacle of nation after nation abandoning the gold standard. Our notoriously fluctuating money was rendered more unstable, working serious injustice to creditors and debtors, respectively, with every rise and fall in the price level. Add to this confusion the ruthless and confidence-destroying operations of not a few trusted financiers and the epidemic of recent

bank failures, and you have a startling impressionistic picture that has become intensely, ruinously realistic.

8. *The profit motive.* The central motivating force, the chief actuating principle of business has been the desire for gain—the capitalistic system has been built up by the profit motive. The machine age has thrust society into “an orgy of money-getting.” Social productivity has faltered before the assaults of a profitivity economy; and there has been no unseen hand to transmute the baser metals of greed and vanity into the pure gold of the common good. Here is an antecedent to this and to every depression that must give us pause. Under a reign of selfishness there is no escape from corruption and demoralization. Man’s unchecked greed will prove his ruin as in ages past: if he would attain true success, let him take up his cross daily, follow the gleam of the ages, and be his brother’s keeper.

Recapitulating the positive or active antecedents and causes, I have pointed out the consolidation and concentration of industry, the tendency to unwarranted expansion of credit and consequent over-speculation, the apparent over-production which is more accurately expressed as under-consumption, the *impasse* brought about by a series of tariff walls, the foundation fact of depressed agriculture, the inequitable distribution of the world’s gold coupled with an unstable currency and unsound financing, and the havoc wrought by the unbridled profit motive. Without doubt a complete picture would include still other factors. If at first thought one is inclined to find a single all-sufficient cause or explanation for the great depression, sober second thought will convince one of the colossal error. If the observer thinks he finds the antecedents relatively simple and obvious up to the crash of 1929, a more intimate view with the perspective of the last three years reveals the highly complex and elusive character of the present situation. It is unwise to ignore significant features that are actually in the picture in an attempt at over-simplification.

It would be an intriguing task to undertake a quantitative evaluation of each of the eight negative and eight positive factors in the antecedents listed; but I know of no denominator that is common to all the factors; and besides, there is the impossibility of obtaining adequate objective evidence on the basis of which a just weighting might be made. I must content myself, therefore, with having set forth the respective factors and, with due allowance for any others not included, leave their further interpretation and appraisal to others. We are confronted not merely with a theory but a condition. The problem is more than economic—it is intensely human.

# The Kingdom of God Movement in Japan

WILLIAM AXLING

**T**HE Kingdom of God Movement in Japan is root and branch an indigenous movement. It is a vital and vivid demonstration of the fact that Christianity is no longer an alien faith but has struck root in the soil of that empire and has become part and parcel of the nation's life. It indicates that Christianity has gotten into the blood and runs in the veins and arteries of the Japanese people.

This significant movement was born in the brain and heart of Toyohiko Kagawa. In 1928 when representative Christian leaders of fifty-seven nations were gathered at Jerusalem for that epoch-making meeting on the Mount of Olives, Kagawa, one of Japan's elected delegates but unable to attend, in accordance with his custom was spending the Passion Week in fasting, meditation, and prayer.

Moved by a mystic sense of the creative possibilities of that gathering on Olivet he, twelve thousand miles away, spent the long hours of that week in passionate intercession in its behalf. While keeping that sacred tryst with God there flashed across his soul a divine mandate to launch in Japan a great forward-looking, forward-moving evangelistic effort.

This vision came to him in an hour when his soul was clear-eyed and far-seeing as the result of long-continued open-hearted fellowship with God. Back of it, however, there lay an historical approach. His study of the Huguenot movement in France had deeply impressed him with the fact that the power of Christianity to fashion the moral, social, political, and religious ideals of a nation and mold its total life is dependent upon the momentum of its impact.

The qualitative phase of the Christian impact is necessarily the most important and the most dynamic, but the quantitative force of that impact is also a creative factor. This observation aroused in him the conviction that if the Christian faith is to infiltrate every phase of Japan's life and become the norm in all her ways it must have at least one million followers.

This conviction, based on historical facts, and the vision which flashed upon his soul in one of its luminous moments, both pointed in the same direction. They indicated that the hour had struck for the Christian forces of Japan to launch out into a great spiritual adventure.

*An All Christians Crusade.*—It is one thing to see a vision, it is quite a different thing to share it with others in such a way that it will illumine their hearts, fire their imaginations, and stir in them the crusading spirit.

Whenever and wherever Kagawa made known his vision and attempted to lay the heaven-sent mandate on other hearts he ran into a solid wall of doubts, difficulties, and towering question marks.

Seventy years of heroic endeavor had produced only three hundred thousand Christians in Japan, including the Greek and Roman Catholic communions. How could any movement, no matter how all-inclusive its constituency or far-reaching its scope, within any reasonable time push the number of Christians in this land up to so full a figure?

Kagawa's faith, however, feeds on difficulties. His God is the God of the impossible. Once convinced that God has spoken, obstacles are transformed into challenges. He asks neither why nor how, but follows the gleam.

Incessantly he kept the vision before his friends and followers. Every plan and purpose was focused toward bringing it into the realm of reality. After a period of quiet cultivation within a circle of kindred spirits he laid it on the heart and conscience of the officers of the National Christian Council of Japan, and both the Executive and the Commission on Evangelism of this representative body put themselves whole-souledly back of plans for its realization.

This organization mothered the project, and through its Commission on Evangelism a Central Committee, representing most of the communions and Christian groups of the empire, was set up to carry the movement forward to its goal. This committee took six months to mature its plans and to mobilize the Christian forces. Ninety interdenominational Regional Committees were organized across the empire in order to give autonomous powers to cities and communities in initiating and organizing local campaigns and to create a consciousness of solidarity throughout the nation-wide Christian community.

The movement as such was launched January 1, 1930, with simultaneous campaigns in the six largest cities of the empire. It started as a Kagawa movement. His is still the colorful and potent personality around which it is centered. Since its inception, however, it has gathered such momentum that to-day it is no longer a one-man movement. It has expanded into an All Christians Crusade.

In this crusade we are witnessing a spectacle seen only in the early Christian centuries. Here practically all of the Christians of an entire empire are pooling their prayer-power, their soul-power, their man-power, their collective experience, and their material resources in a nation-wide all-inclusive evangelistic effort.



This movement knows no East or West, no North or South. It sweeps the empire four square. It knows no denominational differences. It leaps across sectarian barriers. Through it the Christians of Japan, interrelated and unified, are moving out into the pagan world around them with an unbroken front.

*A Passion to Pioneer.*—There breathes through this movement the spirit of the pioneers and the trail-blazers. During the past seventy years Christian activity in Japan has been centered largely in her fast-expanding cities. While this has been in accord with Paul's missionary policy it has left great outlying areas untouched with the gospel message.

Thirty million farmers, 5,500,000 industrial workers, 1,500,000 fishing folk, 500,000 miners, great groups of the 2,500,000 students, 1,000,000 toilers in the field of transportation, and another 1,000,000 employed on public works are still unreached. The Christian Church in that land has drawn its converts largely from the great middle class, with a strong mixture of students and accessions from the professional classes.

The leaders in this movement feel that they have been given a mandate from God to push out the frontiers of the Christian occupation and raise the flag of Christ in these neglected areas. They plan to work their way into every group of the population, so that no class shall be able to say, "The Christian Church has no thought for us; no man cares for our souls." This is a goal which has not as yet been reached in any land. Missions to the rural villages, the factory areas, the fishing fields, the mining camps, the laborers, and the great student centers hold a central place in the movement's program.

*A Full-Orbed Program.*—This is an evangelistic movement. It majors in evangelism. During the years 1930 and 1931, 3,000 evangelistic meetings were held for the masses; 2,400 of the 2,800 Protestant churches of the empire participated in these meetings. Many of the remaining 400 churches are in territory not as yet reached by the movement.

These meetings covered all the cities, many of the larger towns, and some of the rural centers of population. Over half a million people attended them. Of that number 26,746 signed cards as inquirers. This is an average of one signature in every twenty of those in attendance, and opens a window into the spiritual hunger of the Japanese heart. It also reveals the unparalleled Christian opportunity in that land at the present time.

Those who are pouring their life's blood into this crusade cannot forget, however, that men and women live in communities and work in groups, and

that this community life and group life are determining factors in the making or the breaking of men, women, and even children.

This movement, therefore, sets up as one of its major goals the humanizing and Christianizing of the social and the industrial order. It is definitely out to Christianize every human relationship; the relation of the ruler and the ruled, the capitalist and the laborer, the employer and the employee, and the owner and the tenant. It is endeavoring to make Jesus' way of life, his values, his standards, and his spirit the norm and actually operative wherever man meets man, where women work and weep, and where children are not getting a fair and full chance.

As an outstanding feature of an out-and-out evangelistic movement this is unique, and puts this crusade in a class by itself. It puts heavy emphasis on the social phase of the Christian program, a phase which some sections of the church of the West tragically neglect and other sections of that church repudiate on the ground that it is not a legitimate part of its work in the world.

As one means of realizing this goal, the movement is bringing together Christian factory owners and Christians employing laborers in large numbers in round-table conferences for the purpose of studying from the Christian point of view such fundamental questions as capitalism, the relation of the employer and the employee, wages, hours, housing conditions, and other acute problems in the industrial world.

In order to eliminate the acquisitive motive, the cut-throat competition, and the goal of personal profit from the present-day industrial and economic order, and create in their place the spirit of co-operation and service, the movement urges the organization of mutual aid guilds in every church, and producers and consumers co-operatives in every community.

*The Second Mile.*—This movement is being carried forward on a high tide of sacrificial service. Just previous to the launching of this venture, Kagawa, saying that he wished to do something more, something above, something beyond what he was already doing to win Japan for Christ, voluntarily put himself in the hands of the Central Committee for a period of three years. He declared that he would serve anywhere and at any time as a crusader in this crusade. He, however, laid down one condition. He stipulated that he would not accept a single cent out of the funds of the movement as salary or remuneration. He insisted that his work in connection with this movement should be extra and above his regular and usual program.

His three social settlements, one in Tokyo, one in Osaka, and one in

Kobe, are each of them a big job for a big man. Yet he carried them financially and in every way on his own lone shoulders. In spite of this he declared that he was not satisfied, wanted to do something more, and do it without remuneration.

That lead became contagious. Two executive secretaries are devoting great blocks of their time to this movement. Some forty people are serving on its Central Committee. More than six hundred are serving on the ninety Regional Committees. Between fifty and sixty Japanese pastors, evangelists, Christian educators, laymen, laywomen, and missionaries are giving great areas of their time out in the field crusading as evangelists to the masses. These are busy people with crowded programs. Yet all have adopted the motto that their work in connection with this crusade must be the second mile with Christ, a bigger bit for their fellow men.

This evangelistic drive has in a measure recaptured the crusading spirit of the early church and is being carried forward through a vast voluntary outpouring of life and effort. With the exception of the clerks in the office and the full-time editor of the *Kingdom of God Weekly*, the official organ of the movement, no one related to this venture is receiving a salary out of the funds of the movement.

*Church Centric.*—This movement has lifted the Christian cause in the Japanese Empire above narrow sectarian issues and goals, and thrust it out on a plane with wide horizons. But it is not anti-church, or non-church, or super-church in its motive and purpose. It magnifies the Christian Church. It believes that this institution has across the centuries garnered into its life and experience a cultural and spiritual heritage of inestimable value. This heritage it strives not only to conserve but to enrich.

Although many of the meetings for the masses are held in theaters and public auditoriums the local pastors and Christians are made the organizing and directing forces. Moreover, the results of these meetings are in every way possible directed into the local churches. It is the policy of the Central Committee, however, not to assist in local campaigns through furnishing funds and supplying speakers unless such campaigns are a united effort of the majority of the communions and churches of that area.

*An Educational Technique.*—There throbs through this movement a passion to evangelize the masses and in every phase of its program it sounds the evangelistic note. The driving force back of it, however, is not a shallow effervescent emotionalism. It is balanced and stabilized by an educational technique.

The unfinished task in Japan will never be carried to completion by

missionaries sent out from the older churches of the West. Neither can the great unreached classes and masses be evangelized by paid Japanese pastors and evangelists, unless we are satisfied to postpone the evangelization of that nation to the far, far distant future.

Impelled by this conviction, the leaders of this crusade are endeavoring to raise up an army of at least five thousand lay preachers—laymen and laywomen—who, in the communities where they live and in the circles in which they move, will as they go about their daily tasks hold up the torch of Christ and give ardent testimony of their Christian faith and experience to kith and kin, to friends and fellow townsfolk.

For the purpose of training the laity for this type of participation in the campaign, also with a view to nurturing the inquirers enlisted in its various meetings, Training Institutes for Christians are held in every city and center of population. During 1931 thirty-one such institutes were held in the different parts of the empire. These were attended by ten thousand four hundred delegated Christians, chosen by the churches of the area covered by the institutes because of some special qualification to become a part of this army of lay evangelists.

Moreover, in order to push forward the drive into the unoccupied rural regions, the movement is putting special emphasis on the holding of Peasant Gospel Schools. Japan's 30,000,000 farmers live in thirteen thousand rural villages. All of these are virgin fields for the gospel. The future of these villages is in the hearts and hands of their youth.

A Peasant Gospel School gathers together from twenty to thirty picked young people, potential village leaders, from as many villages from a defined rural area. For a week or ten days each year during the slack season on the farm it gives them intensive training in Bible study, Sunday-school methods, evangelism, recreational work for the young, home betterment, village betterment, and better farming.

Most of these young people return to their respective villages and start something: a Bible class, a Sunday school, a reading club, a study group, a recreational center, some form of village helpfulness, anything to give Christ a chance in the village and inaugurate a new day for its people. During 1931 and the first six months of 1932 seventy of these schools were held in seventy different rural sections. These schools trained a thousand young people whose lives are dedicated to the task of giving voluntary Christian leadership to the seven hundred villages from which they came.

During the present year this same technique has been adapted to meet the needs of industrial communities. Industrial Gospel Schools are being

held in the cities and in the industrial centers with a view to reaching the youth of these areas and training them to render the same kind of service in their congested communities.

Another phase of the movement's educational emphasis is its large use of Christian literature. Japan is the most literate nation in the world. Her literacy stands at the remarkably high figure of 99.7, lacking only three tenths of one per cent of being a perfect one hundred. Her people are inveterate readers.

With the threefold object of training Christians, teaching inquirers, and evangelizing the unevangelized the movement is publishing *The Kingdom of God Weekly*. Within two years this periodical has leaped from an absolutely new undertaking in the field of publication to a weekly circulation of 30,000, and is making a most significant contribution to the Christianization of the nation.

The movement is also issuing and making extensive use of specially prepared pamphlets and tracts setting forth various phases of the Christian message. These are published and used in mass quantities. During the past two years 500,000 of these pamphlets have been sold, and 2,000,000 leaflets have been distributed among the non-Christian population.

At the suggestion of the Central Committee of the movement both the British and American Bible Societies have put out special "Kingdom of God Movement" editions of the New Testament. In order to put them within the reach of every reader these Testaments have been priced at the extraordinary low figure of three cents. To date sixty thousand of these have been sold.

This use of the printed page—*The Kingdom of God Weekly*, the issuing of pamphlets and leaflets, and the specially published low-priced New Testament—is carrying the Christian message into homes and hearts far beyond the reach of the spoken word.

*A Timely Movement.*—Japan has fallen on troubled and turbulent times. Within and without there is turmoil and conflict. The dominant factors underlying this unrest are economic and social.

Back of her drive into Manchuria is the pressure of over-population, 2,722 people on every square mile of her cultivatable land, 65,000,000 people crowded on to 147,440 square miles of land, 85 per cent of which is mountainous.

Finding that the saturation point had been reached on the farms which have sustained her people through the centuries, Japan twenty-five years ago turned her thought and energy toward industrialization. In this



field she was forging ahead with feverish haste and marvelous success when she ran pell-mell into the tangle of tariffs, quotas, and embargoes in every part of the world. These threaten to bring her industries and commerce to a standstill.

Moreover, discriminatory legislation in America, Canada, Australia, and Brazil putting a ban on her immigrants seriously aggravated her problems. This legislation and the towering tariff barriers built across all Western nations have driven Japan back on her mountainous islands and shifted her "life line" to Manchuria as the only remaining area from which she can secure food supplies and the raw materials necessary for her industrial program on which her population, increasing at the rate of from 800,000 to 1,000,000 a year, is dependent for work and wages and life itself.

She has 2,500,000 students in her higher educational institutions; 700,000 in her secondary schools, 1,500,000 in her technical schools, and 300,000 in her universities and graduate schools. During the past five years eighty per cent of the graduates of these schools have failed to secure employment.

The lot of her laborer has been a hard one. Wages have been low, hours long, and living conditions often bad. During and following the World War things took a turn for the better. A factory law favoring the laborer was passed. Agitation and pressure forced many employers to adopt an eight-hour day, increase the wage scale and provide better living conditions. The economic slump and unemployment, however, have checked this advance in her labor world, and there is danger that conditions will drift back to what they were.

The peasants as a class are fighting a losing fight with adverse conditions. All are heavily in debt. Many are pitifully poor. Multitudes of them are at the mercy of absentee landlords to whom they must pay from fifty-five to seventy per cent of all that they raise.

All of the above three classes—the students, the laborers, and the peasants—furnish a fertile field for communistic propaganda, and many of them are to-day avowed and aggressive followers of Karl Marx.

Because they were looked upon as a counter influence, ultra-patriots and ultra-nationalists have been given a free hand. In the name of patriotism these ultras have been allowed to resort to force and violence in order to forward their cause. Gradually this movement gathered such momentum that there were scores of bands organized under various names all over the country. Finally, a fiery patriotism flowered into a fiery fanaticism,

and before the government knew what had happened it had a full-fledged Fascist movement on its hands.

These Fascists turned their guns on two classes, the corrupt politicians and the greedy capitalists—on the ground that the corruption of the one and the greed of the other make them inimical to the state. The politicians and the capitalists in Japan have for many years been an interlocking directorate manipulating, for their mutual advantage, the nation's political and economic life. These Fascists are in revolt against this whole situation and are espousing the cause of the common man.

Thus the Communists, the Fascists, and the Christians through the Kingdom of God Movement are in Japan to-day in a life-and-death struggle to win the common man for their respective ideals and causes. On the outcome of this struggle hangs that nation's destiny.

Japan's present pains are birth pangs. She will emerge from these agonies with a chastened soul. Is it a matter of mere chance that at this critical hour in her history Kagawa should have come on the scene and the Kingdom of God Movement come to the birth, both pointing her to Christ and his gospel as the way out?

*The Dynamic of the Movement.*—This movement puts heavy emphasis on human relations and on the humanizing and Christianizing of these relations. It is not, however, a so-called humanistic movement. This crusade is rooted in God. It summons men to rethink God, to rediscover God, to re-explore God, and to re-experience God. It challenges men to make life, the whole of life, a conscious crusading venture with God.

Its dynamic is Christ and the cross. All who are engaged in this high adventure are profoundly convinced that Christ, and Christ alone, can meet Japan's dire needs, individual, social, and national, and the cross, the cross alone, can furnish a dynamic mighty enough to move that nation onward and upward to its God-given goal.

# Education, the Scales for Weighing Religion

STUART A. COURTIS

**T**IMES which try men's souls inevitably lead to reflection and appraisal. Two outstanding social changes which have taken place in the immediate past have been (1) the rise in society's evaluation of education and (2) the decline in its evaluation of religion. It is not strange, therefore, that out of the anxiety and despair of the prevailing depression, two fundamental queries have been forcing themselves upon the attention of thinking men the world around: (1) "Is our supposed progress in education really a move in the wrong direction?" and (2) "After all, does religion possess something vital that the world cannot get along without?" If the questioner happens to be a professional worker in either field, these two questions are fused to produce a third which includes both but adds a new element: "What is the relation of education to religion, or of religion to education?" according to the viewpoint of the questioner.

This article will present the views of one who believes in progressive education and whose major professional interests have been, for many years, the scientific study of educational problems. His qualifications to discuss the religious aspects of the situation are only those of a layman, born into functional church membership in mid-Victorian days, and by the grace of God continuing in the same, with the ever-growing conviction that his ability to tap religious sources of power and inspiration increases as the years roll by. The general thesis of the article will be that to-day the finger of God is again writing on the wall, this time for professional religion, "*Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin*"; that, willynilly, education is being forced to assume many functions which in the past have been peculiarly religious in nature; and that if no steps are taken to prevent it, the present evolutionary trends will strip the church, as an institution, of much of its former position and value. From this point of view, education is a measuring instrument by which the might and worth of religion may be determined. The relation between education and religion is the pointer of the scales by which the movements of the balance may be read.

To an evolutionist, the faith of the many in social institutions as divinely created and enduring entities seems passing strange. Few people are sufficiently scientifically minded to view the home, the church, the school,

and the state as man-made devices to provide channels for the efficient functioning of natural forces. In less fundamental situations, all accept with simple piety the existence of such natural forces as the hurricane, the lightning, and the heat of the sun. One may readily admit that (in religious terms) God made electricity, but certainly man fashioned the electric motor that capitalizes the potentialities of God's creation and turns it to practical use. So with the natural energies implicit in personality and social life. Whatever one may believe about the ultimate source of these natural powers, there can be no doubt that man, consciously or unconsciously, fashions the machinery by which these powers function, and *changes that machinery at will to meet the needs of the day*. Witness the detachment of industry from the home and the building of our modern factory system, with all its disrupting consequences in terms of changes in social life. Witness the similar detachment of child-nurture from the home and the growth of child-nurturing agencies, the church, the school, the hospital, and various types of recreational centers. If a function can be detached from one institution and given to another, there is no reason why the process cannot be repeated. In our day both church and home are being stripped of one function after another until both seem mere empty shells, compared with their former grandeur.

From the evolutionary viewpoint, the home is the primary and basic institution. The clan, or state, was merely a later expression on a larger scale of the same needs and forces which created the home. But the first step in the disintegration of the home was probably the formalization of personal religion, the development of priest craft, the building of religion as an institution. So vital was this theft, so important the functioning of forces we call religion, that for long periods of time and under a great variety of conditions the church was able to dominate both home and state. Strangely enough, it was the church which furthered the process of disintegration by taking over from the home the educative function and establishing the school. With the advent of "business" and "science," a new element was introduced into the situation. Secular purposes and ends were suddenly enhanced in value, and the world went materialistic. The separation of church and state inevitably followed. Wisdom took on a worldly meaning and education was seen to have possibilities as a means of social control. Accordingly the state assumed the direction of education. Thus each of our form major institutions was at length free to evolve in terms of its own powers and potentialities.

In the fierce struggle of free competition, the home and the church

as institutions are losing out. What function of the primitive home is not to-day discharged more efficiently by social institutions? A primitive need of man was for protection during periods of eating, sleeping, mating, and nurturing the products of mating. To-day the function of protection is completely in the hands of the state. Of all the primitive functions, the most trivial is the one most frequently used as a basis of definition. Thus man's home is defined to-day as the place where he habitually sleeps. Eating and nurture are increasingly carried on under more advantageous circumstances *outside the home*. Business and pleasure have been almost completely detached from the home. Procreation is still intimately associated with the home, but is repudiated as a desirable activity by an increasingly larger number of individuals. Birth control, companionate marriage, and an increasing divorce rate, tell a story which even he who runs may read.

On the mental and spiritual levels, the important functions of the primitive home were to supply recognition and sympathy, to awaken love, self-discipline, and co-operation, to stimulate inspiring ideas and ideals. But conditions of living have so changed in our time that, on the one hand, opportunity for such functioning steadily diminishes in the modern home, for its members are able to spend less and less time in each other's company; and on the other hand, social agencies meet the spiritual needs of individuals more completely than they can be met in the home. To-day many individuals are winning far more complete and satisfying recognition from their professional associates than they could possibly hope for *even in an ideal home*. Similarly, as social consciousness awakens, the inspiration of service to national, or international needs, the love of humanity, loyalty to "causes" and "movements" are proving even more powerfully stimulating to personal growth and creative effort than the old loyalties to sweet-heart, country, or religion. The automobile and airplane, telephone, radio, movies, and television are all doing their share, on the one hand to detach our feelings and thinkings from the narrow personal attachments which have meant so much to man in the past, and on the other hand, to make us consciously members of one great family.

To the scientific analyst, the importance of religion in the past seems to have depended on the fact that the church as an institution has everywhere capitalized the sources of power in man. The church has been a storehouse of potential but unrealized values; a revealer of possibilities, an interpreter of meanings. Apparently it has not been necessary that the revelations be true, or the interpretations correct. It has been sufficient



that they awaken in man visions, loyalties, desires which stimulated him to put forth creative efforts to achieve them and lead him to subordinate self-interest to a larger and more impersonal self. This leads to the opinion that to-day the church is impotent, not because man has attained the maximum of his potentialities, but because the leaders in religion do not seem to be able to think of religious verities except in terms of an outgrown symbolism.

The present difficulties in which religion and education find themselves appear to arise from diametrically opposite causes. Education is questioned because it has been too progressive; religion because it has not been progressive enough.

Two hundred years ago education was conceived quite universally as the acquisition of knowledge and skill. The existing social order, believing in the sacredness of its wisdom and jealous for its own existence, accepted as a religious duty the *indoctrination* of the oncoming generation with its own ideals and virtues. The function of the school was to *transmit* the wisdom of the ages, the function of the pupil was to *learn* by memorization, and to recite or "re-tell" that wisdom unchanged in the slightest particular. Commencement exercises were official certifications that the pupil had been properly prepared by the molding and forming process to take his place in society and carry on its sacred traditions. The supreme goal of education was conformity, conformity to the adopted specifications for good citizenship both in this world and *in the next*. As *memorization* was the only method of learning, so *corporal punishment or discipline* was the only method of bringing about learning, and "*obedience to authority*" was the supreme virtue.

In the course of social evolution the time came when the individual rebelled against the established order. Authority had made life too luxurious for itself, too hard for the common man. The struggle for "liberty, equality and fraternity," and for "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," slogans expressing these fundamental spiritual needs of man, was eventually successful to the degree that it put into the hands of the common man the right to determine his own destiny. One consequence of this successful rebellion was the dictation to the school-master, "You may not flog our children." For more than two thousand years, the precept, "Spare the rod and spoil the child," had been the basis of both educational and parental training, and headshaking and direful prophecies of future catastrophe began. Teachers, deprived of their chief source of power, were forced to invent other devices to make children learn.

"Methods" of teaching and teacher training appeared in the world at closely the same time.

The first device that proved effective has been labeled "Predigestion." By careful study and analysis, by experience, by deliberate trial and error, pedagogues attempted to locate points of difficulty, to prepare explanations and to use methods of presentation which would make learning *easy* for the child. Thus, intellectual understanding was added to mere verbal acquisition as a co-ordinate aim of education.

The efforts of the schoolmaster to devise methods of teaching that would make learning easy soon led to the discovery of the importance of interest and activity in learning. Education then took another step forward, or at least away from the "good old times." A "soft" pedagogy developed. Amuse, interest the child at all costs; keep him busy, active, too occupied for mischief; hope that somehow a miracle will occur, so that the child will acquire those items of knowledge which it is essential that all men acquire. For a time motivation was the last word in educational method.

In the meantime, however, evolution was taking place in more than teaching. The scientific study of human behavior began and the science of psychology was born. Other sciences were vigorously extending the bounds of human knowledge in every field and increasing the sum total of human information. A mechanistic and materialistic age was putting a premium on trainings which paid dividends in terms of comfort, pleasure, money, and power. The demand for the purely cultural and æsthetic diminished correspondingly. Moreover, with the increase in leisure time and surplus wealth, there was a corresponding increase, on every level, in the number of individuals to be educated. Mass education became the rule; a formal superficial process of social veneering, which to-day barely serves to disguise, but not to hide, much less transform, the play of primitive instincts.

But all has not been loss. Tradition has been broken down. Function after function of child nurture has been shifted from the home and other institutions and centered in the school. In spite of the inefficiency of educational efforts, the functions and value of education have been enormously enriched. To-day the school is universally expected to minister to the needs of the whole child; bodily development, healthful exercise, leisure-time activities, sports and games; to give information about the universe and all that it contains; to transmit history, literature, the social science, and the fine arts; to give training in government vocational activities,

moral virtues, preparation for parenthood; to develop personal character. No longer does the hand that rocks the cradle rule the world, but *potentially* at least the school is the womb where new civilizations and cultures grow and out of which they are born. The modern revolutionists, as in Russia and Italy, early seize upon the schools and fashion the oncoming generation to suit their own desires. Meanwhile the psychologists in their laboratories and the philosophers in their studies discover, analyze, and synthesize facts and theories endlessly. On paper, Utopia can be more clearly visioned than ever before in human history. In the laboratory the processes by which personalities are integrated are brought more certainly under control with each passing year. Socially, interdependence, world consciousness, and many other elements of functional unity and brotherhood, are more widespread than ever before. To the interested observer it is as if all the pieces of a great dissected map of the kingdom of heaven were being placed and organized by a master hand before one's very eyes preparatory to a consummatory movement that would fit the whole together. To date, however, the integrating element is missing.

It is this sense of something lacking which is causing men to question. Has education gone too far in granting individual liberty and stimulating creative initiative? Are indoctrination, conformity, and obedience necessary to insure social integrity and progress? Is democracy a failure, equality a futile dream, control of the immature of whatever age by the able a practical necessity? Is the missing element religion? Are there mystic forces and personalities in the long run which direct the affairs of the universe, punishing men for their sins and crushing with humbling ruthlessness all those evidences of man's power and control which have made him so proud of himself and his achievements?

How shall religion be defined? The dictionary says "Religion is the outward act or form by which men indicate recognition of a god or gods to whom obedience and honor are due." Certainly there are few professional religionists who are willing to approach religion from the scientific point of view, and define religion in terms of its effect upon man, instead of in terms of man's relationship to an unknown and unknowable God. At best, God is but a symbol for what is, on man's side, a finite, human experience. That that experience may have an aspect which transcends man's perceptions of matter, time, and space, in no way diminishes the fact that religious experiences are also finite, objective realities, susceptible to a degree of study and control just as all other human experiences are, and no more nor less so. But what may the modern educationalist teach the child in the

way of knowledge in religion or in any field? Does man possess any fund of certain truth about anything? The answer of the world's most competent thinkers is, No! All that man knows is finite and relative, personal experience of God, and even interpretation of supreme revelations of God, included.

To-day the progressive schools teach the child that man is a problem solver, a seeker after truth, an evolving spirit driven by persistent desires for self-expression and self-realization, a creature of evident undeveloped potentialities in a world dealing with energies and destinies seen at best only "as through a glass, darkly." Nor are these verities taught as mere verbal statements of truth. Far from it. The progressive educator to-day seeks first to stimulate purposes to give the child significant experiences, to aid him to acquire control over his experiences, and finally to help him generalize from his experiences, in a word, *to rebuild for himself* the unreal world of concepts in which we think we live. The new education has abandoned the acquisition of knowledge and skill as unworthy aims; it is concerned wholly with the process of integrating personalities, of making conditions suitable for child-growth. It believes in the unrevealed potentialities of human nature; it attempts to control only by the power of verifiable truth, it indoctrinates only through revelation to the individual of the known facts about the past which contribute to his understanding of himself and to the visioning of possibilities for improvement. One of its aims is to teach children the methods by which problems are solved, to supply them with all known materials for solution, but it cannot foresee what the problems of the new age will be, nor if it could, would it dare dictate their solutions.

The professional religionist commends the greater part of the progressive educational program but contends that religion alone can supply a missing and vital element—an understanding and appreciation of the ultimate destiny of man. When asked to state that destiny, it gives only such meaningless replies as "life in heaven with God," or, more briefly, "the glory of God," symbols which to-day have no power to stir human imagination. Modern youth immediately asks, "What is God?" "Where is heaven?" To such legitimate questionings religion has been unwilling to give any answer not couched in terms of submission to a postulated supreme personality which can neither be observed nor experienced at will. Science has explored space deeply by means which even high-school students can make their own. The evidence is complete and satisfactory that heaven and hell as *places* of abode in space and time are too remote from

human experience to be in the same class with suns, stars, and nebulae. Consequently, these concepts are relegated to the world of the imaginary and lose their potency in terms of practical affairs. "God," as an explanatory interpretation of one to whom lightnings and storms, earthquakes and disasters, life and death are mysteries, serves a real and satisfying purpose, but "God," as a symbol of a ruling beneficent creator in a deterministic world where there are adequate explanations in terms of cause and effect of all natural phenomena, also loses its stimulating power. Many religionists forget that Jesus' answers to these same questions in his day, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father," and "The kingdom of Heaven is within you," are just as intriguing to modern youth as they were to the men to whom they were addressed. Can anyone doubt that if Jesus were to preach to young people to-day, he would speak *their language* with power? If the church will not, the schools must.

To those of us who have had experiences which we interpret as personal contact with a supernatural personality, who have experienced what we are pleased to call divine guidance, who, in short, have been trained to attach certain vital human experiences to conventional symbols, God is as real as matter, or light. One who through religion has surrendered self-will to cosmic purposes and has identified his own good with nothing less than the good of the universe as a whole, finds suddenly his creative power and joy in growth greatly increased, his slavery to impulse, matter, time and space correspondingly diminished. The conventional interpretation is that God comes, as Jesus has promised, and lives in him and works through him. He is literally "born again." Natural values no longer satisfy; he lives for supernatural and eternal values. His rewards are those which all men desire, adventure, enduring personal recognition, peace, and joy. These are precisely the values youth in all ages instinctively seeks.

There is no doubt whatever that man is born into a material world, subject to perceptions and impulses which eventuate in natural values and satisfactions. The "will to live" is the fundamental natural desire, the "will to power" is a close second. With these are associated all those possessive and aggressive instincts which express themselves as lust, pride, greed, and egotism. But this is not the whole story. There are other forces in man which war against his natural tendencies. Sympathy, love, unity, growth, demand a totally different organization of behavior for their realization. *In the spiritual world one gets by giving, not by grabbing.* Whenever, wherever, and however the new type of organization of behavior



occurs, there life goes forward and supernatural values emerge to play a determining part in individual and world affairs. Conversely, whenever a type of organization becomes dominant which furthers the expression of the natural impulses, there progress halts and eventually life goes backward.

It is imperative for human happiness and progress that all men undergo the second birth. Some of us would like to define religion as the process of revealing supernatural values to men and teaching men to live by them. That God is himself the supreme supernatural value in no way detracts from the necessity for helping each individual *to make the supreme generalization for himself*. The educationalist believes that the psychological methods which have proved most effective for secular growth would prove most effective for spiritual growth as well. He acknowledges that under ideal conditions secular education would probably be the handmaiden of religion operating under its direction and serving its purposes. An organized and functioning religion would probably be able to supply an element in education for which the ordinary classroom should probably do little more than prepare the ground.

The perplexing question, however, is "When and how is religion to discharge its rightful function?" Certainly, it is not now so functioning in the lives of the many that throng our elementary schools, secondary schools, or colleges. In the meantime, social pressure for character education, and the immediate needs of schools and universities themselves, make it imperative that something be done at once to interpret life to children and to organize their powers around worthy individual and social purposes. Active experimentation along these lines under modern scientific conditions is already under way in many educational centers.

As stated at the outset, it is the writer's conviction that education has become the balances in which religion will ultimately be weighed. Education is to-day called upon (a) to develop in children sound bodies and to teach them the laws of physical and mental health; (b) to develop all mental powers and capacities, to stimulate wide curiosities and to furnish searching minds with selections from the world's store of knowledge and skill appropriate for the peculiar nature of the individual; (c) to socialize the individual by revealing to him his social nature and background, and by giving him training in government, co-operation, vocational endeavor, civil and international purposing; (d) to discipline will and desire, and to develop virtue and character. Of necessity it will learn to do its work more and more efficiently as time goes on.

How will religion react to this functioning, so near its own field? Will it be *possible*, even, for education to carry out its own program without transcending its field and definitely providing for true religious training and development, *even though that training be disguised*, as it must, in terms of the here and now? Is there danger that some mystic intangible will be missing from such a training? Who can tell? Certainly to an educationalist who, like the writer, believes as Jesus did, in the directive control of a loving all-powerful Father, there is no cause for alarm, but only anxiety to be sensitive to God's revelation of his purposes that one may govern his behavior aright, whichever pathway proves to be the best. This anxiety the religionist, of course, must also feel. *The situation seems ripe* for co-operative endeavor to solve a common problem.

## Some Ethical Insights of Prophecy

JOHN PATERSON

IF justification is required for such a title it is to be found in etymology. The Hebrew word for the prophet's vision means to cleave asunder, to split, to penetrate to the core and see the roots and realities of things. The Old Testament prophets were not without power to predict, but prediction is not the main feature of their ministry. It was the main feature in the case of Greek seers and soothsayers like Cassandra, Teiresias or Calchas. It was so with the Delphic oracle, but the Old Testament prophet is not "mantic" in that sense; it would be equally astray to describe the Greek oracle as prophetic.

"The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him." The prophets were men "*far ben*" with God, standing in his council, sharing his secret, and in sympathy with his purpose. They see all earthly things *sub specie eternitatis*, in the light of the eternal. Insight rather than foresight is their mark and token; they cleave through every appearance and penetrate every sham to declare God's truth and show things as they really are. For reality is never what we see but what God sees; they testify what they have seen and speak with authority, "Thus saith the Lord." "The seer," says Emerson, "must also be a sayer." Vision and common sense are here combined and their utterances are marked by keen ethical insight. One or two of these we may now consider.

### I

There is first the ethic of the thing done and the ethic of the clean heart. That is not peculiarly an ancient conflict; it troubles us still. What is the place of ritual in religion? We have seen the Anglican Church divided over this matter, and the same question has not left untroubled the usual calm of the Church of Scotland. There are echoes of it here to-day. How far are rites and ceremonies and elaborate ecclesiastical structures helpful to the stimulation of religious emotion? There are many who would lay small stress on all such things, who look with affection to some simple, bare, barn-like structure out in the country where first they learned to know God. St. Peter's or St. Paul's would not eclipse for them that tiny "Bethel" or stir emotion in the same degree. The Roman Catholic, however, would fail to understand such feeling or see a reason for it. What are we to say? One man's meat may be another man's poison; *quot homines, tot sententiae*.

In these days when we see churches sparsely filled, it may profit us to look back a moment and see the temple in the 8th century B. C. The building is crowded and the altar is reeking with sacrifice; there is an endless ritual with no intermission of devotion and service. A whole army of fully qualified priests are there to direct the worship. "To what purpose?" says Isaiah in the name of the Lord, "I am full of the burnt offerings of rams and the fat of fed beasts; I delight not in the blood of bullocks or of lambs or of he-goats. . . . Who hath required this at your hands to tread my courts?" The Hebrew equivalent for "churchgoing" is "temple-treading." There can be too much of either and it would really be good for the church at large if the churches were emptied still further. Quality rather than quantity may require to become our aim, if the cause for which the church stands is to make real progress. The high calling is high and it is a standing temptation of all institutional religion to practise discount in the spiritual realm. Against such a tendency any man of insight will set his face steadfastly. Religion to the prophetic spirit consists in being rather than doing, in walk rather than talk. The churches that are filled to-day are ritualistic churches, such as the Roman, for it is always easier to do than to be. The ethic of the thing done may take the place of the ethic of the clean heart. Religion does not end with the washing of hands; its final issue was intended to be the creation of a clean heart and the renewal of a right spirit.

It may be a case of "overstatement" in Jeremiah and Amos when they say that all this paraphernalia has really nothing to do with religion. "I spake not to your fathers nor commanded them in the day I brought them out of Egypt concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices; but this thing commanded I them, saying, Obey my voice . . . and walk ye in all the ways that I commanded you." That is probably akin to the modern preacher's emphasis of one side of a truth, but it sets the emphasis where it ought to be set—on the will and the understanding of the worshiper. Religion is not a ritual; it is a discipline that searches the heart and cleanses the conscience and tasks the intellect.

It is not intended to deny that ritual may have a place and a legitimate place in public worship. For some temperaments the absence of ritual would make worship impossible. But there is danger lest that which was meant to be a means should become an end in itself—as happens so often in the case of high churchmen. There is always present, too, in our religious systems the risk that something which was meant to be a supplement may become a substitute. There is particular reason why Protestant

churches should give good heed to the words of the Apocalypse, "See that thou worship not the angel."

One might make a further objection to the introduction of elaborate ritual; probably it is implicit in the prophetic teaching. Certain tendencies to-day make it fairly explicit. It gives a larger place to works than evangelical Christianity can admit. That may account for Luther's rough treatment of the Epistle of St. James—"a right strawy epistle." For Luther had sufficient insight to see that it is always easier to do than to be. There is much truth in the saying of the late A. B. Davidson, "Pharasaism and Deuteronomy came into the world on the same day." The Gospel is not concerned with man's works. It is not what we do, but what God in Christ has done that matters. The only reaction the evangelical can make here is expressed in the words,

Nothing in my hand I bring,  
Simply to thy cross I cling.

The absence of righteousness can not be made good by the presence of rite, nor can penance take the place of penitence. To think so is to mistake the outward for the inward and to seek the reform of life by external means. Against this the prophets resolutely take their stand and repeat the ethical insight of the old word, "to obey is better than sacrifice."

## II

It may not be out of place here to isolate one particular question which is before the American public at this moment and consider with what ethical insight the prophet regarded it. We refer to the liquor question. We are inclined to think of this as a modern question, but there is "nothing new under the sun." There is not an ancient civilization that did not feel the pressure of this awful problem and seek by prohibitive legislation to restrain its evil consequences. The earliest code of laws, The Code of Hammurapi, published about 2000 B. C., seeks to deal with the abuse and confine it within limits; Scripture is clear in its tenor from Genesis to Revelation. It is no wonder that some of the severest words uttered by the prophets are directed against the sin of intemperance. Most people would agree on the general proposition that "strong drink is raging, wine is a mocker," but it takes a prophet of profound insight just to show us how it rages and mocks. Isaiah reveals the true nature of this evil: "they regard not the work of the Lord, neither have they considered the operation of his hands." Indulgence in strong drink, he found, somehow extirpated the capacity for reli-



gion. He could not tell how, but he states the fact, and anyone who has had experience in the work of social reclamation will admit the truth of his analysis. "Nothing kills the conscience like steady drinking to a little excess," says Sir George Adam Smith, "and religion, even while the conscience is alive, acts on it only as an opiate." It produces a moral incredulity and a spiritual incapacity that blinds men as to the real nature of things; the drunkard is one who, in the realm of morals, has lost the gift of perspective, mistaking things far for things near and things precious for things vile. "They mortgage miserable morrows for nights of madness," says Charles Lamb. Well might Shakespeare put these words in the mouth of Cassiod, "O God, that men should put an enemy in their mouths to steal away their brains! that we should with joy, pleasance, revel, and applause transform ourselves into beasts! . . . O thou invisible spirit of wine! if thou hast no name to know thee by, let us call thee devil." The poet has an insight at times equal to the prophet's and Chaucer is no less incisive when he says,

A lecherous thing is wine . . .  
For drunkenness is very sepulture  
Of man's wit and his discretion.

The praises of wine have been sung, often enough in ribald form; if they are to be sung it should be in a minor key and with a plaintive melody. Carlyle in many respects is closely akin to Amos, the rugged herdsman of Tekoa; Amos does not speak more strongly than the Chelsea sage when he asserts that drink is "the most authentic incarnation of the infernal principle yet discovered." If we at times are tempted to use strong language in the present difficult times, there is a ready arsenal of verbal artillery in the prophets.

Amos resembles Kant in more ways than one; he operates with the doctrine of Divine Righteousness as Kant used the Categorical Imperative. Amos, too, has something about him of "the impartial spectator" as compared with the heart-broken Hosea. The former is looking in wrath at the shattered tables of the law; the latter is looking in pity at the broken heart of God. For that very reason the language of Amos impresses by its strength: "Hear this word, ye kine of Bashan, that are in the Mount of Samaria, which oppress the poor, which crush the needy, which say to their lords, Bring and let us drink." A country is largely made and molded by its mothers; if they are sensual and cruel then it will not be well with that land. When these sins lay hold of our women folk and they throw themselves with abandon into them the end is surely nigh at hand.

We cannot help feeling in a passage like this that unconsciously Amos is putting a libel upon the animal creation. That is the more surprising in Amos considering that he was a rustic. We do this too frequently and it is worth more than a passing thought. We say certain things or certain people are "beastly" when they sin with gross sins. But that is all a libel on the beasts; the beasts are faithful to the Divine ordinance and obey implanted instincts. "The ass knoweth his master and the ox his owner's crib." The stork knoweth her season and the swallow goes not wrong, but "my people" know not. Man is more than a beast; he "looks before and after and pines for what is not." Much of the beast heritage still abides in him and we have a feeling that the last to die in man is not the ape or the tiger, as the poet says, but the ass. Man is so witless, so senseless; "Ephraim is a silly dove." These men and women have done what the fat bulls of Bashan never could do—they have made coarse pleasure the deliberate end of their life.

Intoxication is from the Greek *toxicon*, meaning poison. According to the prophet it works to the death of character as well as to the destruction of the brain cells. Here is seen the measure of his insight, for as Gladstone once said, "It has been said that greater calamities are inflicted on mankind by intemperance than by the three great historical scourges, war, pestilence, and famine. That is true for us and it is the measure of our discredit and disgrace."

We may recall in this connection the words of Schiller, "*Die Weltgeschichte ist das Weltgericht*" ("the history of the world is the judgment of the world"). History justifies the prophetic insight. In that strange 28th chapter of Isaiah we meet something very like a modern scene. It is characteristic of the Hebrew genius that it is never abstract, but always concrete. Here is something very concrete—a drunken scene in old Jerusalem. "They also have erred through wine, and through strong drink are out of the way; the priest and the prophet have erred through strong drink, they are swallowed up of wine, they are out of the way through strong drink; they err in vision and stumble in judgment." There they go, roystering along their drunken ways, a hiccupping, disgusting crowd, leering at the prophet and mocking him over their cups, scorning him and his message. "Whom shall he teach knowledge? and whom shall he make to understand doctrine? them that are weaned from the milk and drawn from the breasts!" Bed-time stories! fairy tales for children!—that is how their moral incredulity makes them regard the word of God. We can hear those bibulous ecclesiastics, who should have been the conscience of the community, but "they

only err in judgment and stumble in judgment, hiccoughing the prophet's words in ribald style. "Precept upon precept, precept upon precept, line upon line, line upon line, here a little, there a little." "We must conceive the abrupt, intentionally short, reiterated and almost childish words of verse 10 as spoken in mimicry with a mocking motion of the head, and in a childish stammering tone" (Ewald). The natural man in Isaiah must have seconded strongly the efforts of the spiritual, for he rounds upon them and with deliberate emphasis pronounces the judgment of God, "Judgment will I lay to the line and righteousness to the plummet; and the hail shall sweep away the refuge of lies and the waters shall overflow the hiding place." He who laughs last laughs best; "He shall have them in derision." Robert Louis Stevenson once remarked, "I believe in the ultimate decency of things; aye, and though I woke in hell I would still believe in it." It is only a penetrating moral insight that can speak so, and that the prophets had in pre-eminent degree. Those who take an austere view of life need not be unduly cast down in these days of depression.

### III

This same vision is revealed in all the prophetic approaches to what we call the Social Problem. "Man is a social animal," says Aristotle, or to put it otherwise in the words of Paul, "None of us liveth to himself." We live in a family, a political group, a state, and our life is largely and mainly made up of these relations. Now these relations may be millstones or they may be stepping stones; they may be weights or they may be wings. That all depends upon their constitution and interaction. To say that is to state the problem. You have it in the days of Amos as we have it to-day, vulgar, flaunting wealth over against heartbreaking poverty and distress—the economic problem in all its poignancy and intractability. The problem is essentially the same to-day, although its form and detail may vary with a different age. But it is all the time man's inhumanity to man.

Blow, blow, ye winds with heavier gust!  
And freeze, thou bitter biting frost!  
Descend, ye chilly, smothering snows!  
Not all your rage as now united shows  
More hard unkindness, unrelenting,  
Vengeful malice unrepenting,  
Than heaven-illuminated man on brother man bestows.

(R. Burns)

As it was in the beginning, is now, and—shall it be forever?

Now it is characteristic of the prophet that he does not leave this problem as he finds it. He illumines it, breaking "through the brush" and coming from the periphery right to the center, reaching to the core of the matter. To him the problem is really a religious problem. It involves a man's relation to God and man's relation to his brother man. The word "religion" does not occur in the Old Testament, but an equivalent is found in the word "covenant." Religion to the Hebrew was a covenantal relationship between God and his people, and the covenant was based on righteousness. "Walk before me and be thou perfect" was the covenant injunction and the people well understood the meaning of the prophet's word, "Can two walk together unless they be agreed?"

It may be necessary here to recall something of the content of Hebrew religion and this we may do briefly. A. B. Davidson has said, "a moral order of which God is not the Guardian and Upholder does not occur to Old Testament thinkers." They could not have understood an idea like that of Matthew Arnold, "a power not ourselves that makes for righteousness." The Hebrew must have the word made flesh every time; the concrete, not the abstract. Justice had to be incarnate and it was incarnate in the character of his God. "This is his name whereby he shall be called, the Lord our Righteousness." Faith may be sorely tried at times, but the prophet will never surrender that fundamental credo: "righteous art thou, O Lord . . . yet let me reason the matter with thee." However often religion may be thrown into the interrogative mood, it will not let any doubt steal its deep-set faith in the righteousness of God. It is the glory of the Hebrew prophets that they held that fast in face of upsurges of barbarism and retrogressive tendencies. This it is that distinguishes the Hebrew from the Greek and Roman, whose best men were so much better than their fickle gods; this it is that has preserved the Jewish people a nation to this time. They have stood by the grave of many civilizations and they still stand the mordant critics of all nations, because they have in them that element of permanence that springs from righteousness and faith in a God of righteousness. W. R. Smith says with truth, "The fundamental superiority of the Hebrew religion does not lie in the particular system of social morality that it enforces, but in the more absolute and self-consistent righteousness of the divine Judge."

So much it is necessary to premise to understand the insight of the prophets here. Righteousness to the Hebrew was not only a divine attribute; it was also a human ideal and duty. One aspect may be and often is emphasized at the expense of the other, but they are mutually dependent.

Transcendentalism may lose sight of the second, while humanism (more properly humanitarianism) may lose sight of the first. But the prophet has insight to see and wit to say that when man has lost sight of the face of him who "is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity" it will be a short step to man's failure to discover the image of God in his brother. The true service of God is bound up with the service of our fellow men and we "know that we have passed from death unto life because we love the brethren."

Corruption and graft arise from bad ethics, and bad ethics are rooted in a vitiated theology, a wrong view of God. The present degeneration of civic and national life, which all wise people deplore, implies a comparison with a previous better state of affairs and with an ideal. One need not pass back beyond the Pilgrim Fathers and the Puritans, or even the Victorians, to find a fruitful comparison. In the days of the Puritans it was a common usage to speak of God as the "great Taskmaster." Men did their work "in the great Taskmaster's eye," and they did it with both hands diligently. That may not be a full view of God and it may give rise to a narrow theology, but it bred religious men and heroes. "The fear of God"—that is another Hebrew word for religion—was before their eyes, and there was no fear of man in their hearts. We do not breed such men to-day; their very pictures are revealing. Those beautifully circled eyebrows were eloquent of a peace within and of a *mens sibi conscia recti*. To-day eyebrows are strangely arched and angular, eloquent of the dispeace that occupies man's heart. What is the reason? Is it not that we have substituted the "fear of life" for the fear of God? We have shifted the center of gravity from heaven to earth, from eternity to time, and laid the emphasis upon life. Life will always be terrifying if it is lived apart from God. That is the real "inferiority complex" of to-day. We have broadened life on the lower stories, but it is strangely narrowed in the upper stories: Life has lost the grand mien; its very complexity overwhelms us so that man goes on his way like one pursued by a great fear or chased by a mighty distress. Cromwell's Ironsides feared God and kept their powder dry; the Pilgrim Fathers knew God was watching all their way and they were instruments of his plan. Of course that made life simple and gave coherence to their every purpose. They had no fear of life or death, but only lest they should fail in their duty. Duty was "the stern daughter of the voice of God"; they were strangely at home amid the thunders of Sinai's law, though they seemed less conscious of the gracious music of the Gospel.

We are not producing Luthers and Knoxes, Cromwells or Lincolns



to-day, nor does the future yield large measure of hope. "What have I gained," says Emerson, full of the same insight, "what have I gained that I no longer immolate a bull to Jove or Neptune or a mouse to Hecate? that I do not tremble before the Eumenides or the Catholic Purgatory or the Calvinistic Judgment day—if I quake at opinion, as we call it, or at the threat of assault or contumely or bad neighbors or poverty or mutilation or at the rumor of revolution or of thunder? If I quake, what matter is it what I quake at?" Verily the "fear of life abounds and this is the age of "quakers."

Israel's history is only an illustration of this; they had lost the "fear of God." If, moreover, there is no clear vision of God's righteousness there will be little consciousness of sin. Where men give small consideration to his attributes, there inevitably will be a low opinion of man, and "the scant measure that is abominable" will prevail. When men come to believe that God can be appeased—the Hebrew word means "to stroke the face"—with elaborate sacrifice, that a man may give "the fruit of his body for the sin of his soul," they will not be long in applying the same methods to more mundane affairs. A corrupted theology begets a rotten morality, and the social problem is before in all its naked ugliness. So immediate and direct is this connection that it can be regarded as reciprocal working. "Thou thoughtest that I was altogether such an one as thyself." The methods used in administering justice they used in the service of God, and they used such methods because they had lost sight of righteousness as a Divine attribute and a human duty. "Hear, O heads of Jacob, and ye princes of Israel, is it not for you to know judgment? who eat the flesh of my people and flay their skin from off them, and they break their bones and chop them in pieces as for the pot, and as flesh within the caldron" (Micah 3. 1-3). "They crop us as a sheep crops grass," said a French peasant of the period of Louis Quartorze; "They treat us as their food," said another on the eve of the Revolution.

The social problem is not essentially different to-day. Some of these old abuses have passed, for they could not survive in the searching light of an edified conscience. "False balances and deceitful weights"—the legislature will take care of that in the modern state. Open falsehood and flagrant venality of justice we hardly expect to find in the law courts of a civilized country, though, often enough, "honesty is the best policy" may be no more than a mere prudential maxim. But we do have refinements of fraud and injustice that the Old Testament never dreamed of, advertising and propaganda, argument by suggestion, adulteration and misrepresenta-

tion of goods, secret commissions and draft, and all the "tricks of the trade." We have nothing to learn here but much to amend. We have indeed "sought out many inventions" and "the thoughts of man's heart have been only evil continually." Practical skill has outrun moral insight and spiritual values have been bartered for material gains.

A keen and calculating selfishness is the enemy of all social welfare. The social problem is created by him who in the presence of his brother man only asks, What can I get out of him? Greed and exploitation, the treating of man as a means and not an end in himself, the regarding him as a "hand" and forgetting he is, as Scripture has it, "a soul"—that is how the social question is born.

Woe unto him that buildeth his house by unrighteousness and his chambers by injustice;

That useth his neighbor's service without wages and giveth him not his hire;

That saith I will build me a vast palace with spacious chambers,

With deep-cut windows, ceiled with cedar and painted with vermilion.

Shalt thou reign because thou excellest in cedar?

Did not thy father eat and drink, and execute law and justice?

He judged the cause of the poor and needy; then it was well.

Was not this to know me? saith Jehovah. (Jeremiah 22. 13-16.)

"They drink wine in bowls," says Amos, "and anoint themselves with the premier oils, but they are not grieved for the hurt of Joseph"; there you see the thoughtless idle rich with all their flaunting wealth infuriating the poor, with never a thought of any communal responsibility or social sympathy. Self and selfish interest are the be all and the end of their luxurious lives. Just this thoughtlessness and lack of the sense of stewardship, the failure to see and grieve for the "hurt of Joseph" and share the sufferings of the whole body politic—that constitutes the problem for the prophet and for us. It is moral and social anarchy. "Surely they all lie in wait for blood; they hunt every man his neighbor with a net." It is *laissez-faire* run mad.

To say there is a problem implies the possibility of a solution. It is not solved by denunciations, although denunciations abound both then and now. These, however, lead nowhere. We must go deeper than that. Herbert Spencer once remarked that it is impossible to form the Golden Age out of leaden instincts. It is well to recall that dictum to-day. We may bring all the inventions of modern science to up-to-date homes and only find that man will continue to sin under electric light as he sinned under rushlight. The kingdom of God does not come from beneath; it is from

above. It is not a new environment men need; it is a new heart. Institutional religion must give place to experimental, and "religiosity" to pure piety. We have been so busy evacuating Scripture of its blood and iron, its strong ethical content; the Gospel has become a "namby-pamby" thing in our hands and we stand helplessly wondering why. "No heart is pure which is not passionate; no virtue is safe which is not enthusiastic."

Dr. John Brown tells of someone who once inquired if he did not feel pity for the patients upon whom he was operating. It was in the days before chloroform was discovered. The surgeon replied, "Yes, I feel such pity that I use the knife." Therein lies a distinction between pity as an emotion and pity as a motive. Most of us enjoy an emotional bath, but that ends with ourselves; the prophetic spirit always feels pity as a motive and it moves him to service. They are "grieved for the hurt of Joseph," and seek to heal it with God's drastic surgery.

We need to-day the vision of the prophets if we are to speak an authentic word of God to our own distressed time. There are three heights our fathers used to gaze upon and they "were marvelously helped until they were strong." These heights have receded far from us. We have traveled far from Mount Sinai and no longer hear the pealing thunder of its law. Mount Cavalry, too, has become dim with distance, where aforetime our fathers felt their hearts awed and their souls subdued. The Great White Throne has ceased to front us with its splendor and challenge, and life goes straggling in a mean and unworthy manner.

"If you would emancipate yourselves from the arbitrary rule and tyranny of men," says Mazzini, "you must begin by rightly adoring God; and in the world's great battles between the two great principles of good and evil you must openly enroll yourself beneath the banner of the first and ceaselessly combat the second." To sum it in words of prophetic insight, "What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with thy God?"

# The Prologue of the Fourth Gospel

(Is It Jewish, Greek, or What?)

DUDLEY TYNG

**I**S the background of our Fourth Gospel essentially Jewish? Is it Greek? Is its background an Oriental religious syncretism? Or, finally, does it spring out of the inner development of Christianity itself? All these positions have their representatives among New Testament students today. In our time of constant and valuable new publication in the biblical field, a short summary and estimate of these standpoints may be of use.

The reader who is interested in the numerous and varied opinions of the so-called *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, a school which endeavors to explain Christianity largely from a non-Jewish environment, can find a good summary and critique of them in Clemen's *Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung (explanation) des Neuen Testaments*. The writers whom he describes seek to derive the ideas of the New Testament, wherever possible, from Hellenistic or syncretistic Oriental sources. Of these attempts the most far-fetched, as far as they touch on the gospel of John, are the various sun-myth theories, which find in the "Light" of the Johannine prologue the key to the explanation of the evangelist. That is, the doctrine of the Light of the World is based ultimately on a sun-myth, like the epic of the Babylonian Gilgamesh, or the story of Hercules. In which connection one is reminded of the clever skit of a French writer of the past generation on the like theorists of his day. He undertook to prove that the story of Napoleon, like that of Jesus Christ, was only a sun-myth. For Napoleon was born in Corsica, and hence, like the sun, arose in the East. He died in Saint Helena, and thus set in the West!

Three writers of this school, Heitmueller, Norden, and Pfeiderer, would like to connect the idea of the *Logos*, or Word, in our gospel with the *Logos*, or Reason, of Heraclitus, which the philosopher defined as eternal, as directing all things according to his laws, as one whom man comprehended not. Thus Heitmueller: "The more educated of the Greek readers of the gospel would naturally recall the beginning of a celebrated book which came into being on the soil of Asia Minor, the book of Heraclitus the Obscure; that began with the statement that the *Logos* was eternal, that all took place according to his laws, and that man comprehended him not." (Cf. John 1. 5.) But, noting the few likenesses here mentioned, one immediately asks, What real resemblance is there, in the

end, between the Fire-Logos of Heraclitus and the Logos-Messiah of John? The *Reason* of the philosopher is not the personal God of the gospel. Even if he were, he is the supreme Deity, and not a subordinate god, which is the status of the *Logos* of John.

Another live question in the writings of this school is the relation of the prologue of our gospel to the so-called Hermetic writings. These are a body of pseudepigraphical literature which center around the name of the god Hermes, often equated with the Egyptian god of wisdom, Thoth. These writings were, or at least came to be, a combination of Philonic Judaism, Neo-Platonism and cabbalistic philosophy. The one most in question here is the *Poimandres* of Hermes the Thrice-Great (*trismegistos*). *Poimandres* (the shepherd of men) is the divine Intelligence, and the fifteen chapters of the book deal with such subjects as the divine nature, world-creation, the fall of man, and the divine illumination by which he alone can be saved. This last, of course, savors of the intellectual mysticism of the Fourth Gospel. But when the writers of this school try to show a connection between this Hermetic wisdom literature and John, we are launched at once into a sea of subjectivity and chronological uncertainty. Thus Bossuet (*Kyrios Christos*, p. 306ff) and Bréhier (*Les Idées Philosophiques et Religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie*, p. 101ff) want to derive the *Logos* of Philo from the early Hermetic literature, and, through Philo, connect them with the gospel. Leisegang (*Pneumá Hagion*) would reverse the process. Norden, on the other hand, would use the Hermetic writings to connect John with faraway Heraclitus. Reitzenstein (*Poimandres*), Wendland, Bossuet, Heitmüller, and W. Bauer all point out the great part that the phrases "Light" and "Life" play in the Hermetic literature, and thus find a point of connection with the gospel. But, after all, such similarities are readily explained. Men who had never heard of each other could easily rhapsodize on light and life. Frequently also the Hermetic use of the words is in a different sense from that of the gospel. Such is notably true of the Odes of Solomon, in which Harnack, looking elsewhere, sought to find the sources of the Johannine theology (*Ein Jüdisch Christliches Handbuch*). A like attempt of Bultmann, this time to derive the ideas of the Prologue from Mandaeism, might also be mentioned. The Mandaeans are an ancient Oriental sect, still surviving in Mesopotamia, whose theology, with its many emanations and æons, has numerous affinities with Gnosticism and Manichæanism. An incarnation of Hibil, a lesser æon, is John, the son of Zechariah. When one compares the simple ideas of our Prologue with the complicated and fantastic theology of the Man-

dæar  
Gen  
fetc  
Wor  
strict  
take  
in so  
myth

the J  
is an  
ical  
been  
parat  
separ  
is in  
case,  
Hell  
lectu  
ings,  
at fir  
easily  
Abso.  
God  
of a s  
cent c  
is eas  
as ha  
positi  
and t  
alread  
Num  
of Str  
Midr  
to exp  
hand  
jecte  
conce  
remot



dæans, one is tempted to speak of Bultmann's attempt, slightly paraphrasing Genesis—"B's mess was four times that of his brethren." Even more far-fetched is the comparison, made by some writers, of the incarnation of the Word in John with the so-called incarnations of the Greek gods. For, strictly speaking, the Greek gods never become incarnate. They either take on a passing human shape, or else the god's power dwells temporarily in some definite human person. There is no real incarnation in Greek mythology.

Two fundamental defects recur, it seems to me, in the writings of the *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*. First, in spite of much learning, there is an inability to analyze and correlate ideas; secondly, there is the uncritical assumption that, if one idea looks or sounds like another, there has been contact and influence. A study of comparative religion and of comparative thought in general would suggest that the human mind, in widely separated areas, be it in the field of lower religion or of higher thought, is in the habit of grinding out astonishingly similar results. That being the case, the writers of this school fail in making out any real influence of Hellenistic religion and philosophy upon the Fourth Gospel. The intellectual mysticism of the evangelist has its affinities with the Hermetic writings, but this proves nothing in particular. The *Logos* of Philo seems, at first sight, to be very close to that of John. But here the differences easily outweigh the likeness. For Philo's God is really a philosophic Absolute, *apoios* or without qualities, fundamentally unknowable. John's God is a personal deity, revealed by the Word. Philo's *Logos* is the center of a series of *logoi*, or subordinate world-principles. John's Word is innocent of any such connections. One positive resemblance, the common name, is easily explained. *Logos* was probably as much a term of the street, and as hazy in popular apprehension, as, say, *evolution*, to-day. The second positive resemblance, namely, that of a being mediating between God and the world, was a familiar one in contemporary Judaism, and had been already domesticated in Christianity through the Christology of Paul. Numerous examples of the first sort can be found in the monumental work of Strack-Billerbeck (*Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, Vol. II). There is no need to have recourse to Hellenistic ideas to explain the sources of the Fourth Gospel, when the materials lie close to hand in Judaism itself. How far given Jewish ideas may have been subjected to Greek or Oriental influences in previous generations need not concern us here. Such influences on our evangelist would, at the most, be remote and indirect.

To an older generation of Christian theologians and exegetes the close dependence of the Fourth Gospel upon the Old Testament and upon Judaism was more or less axiomatic. Older rabbinical authorities, such as Edersheim, Bossuet, and Weber were of a like mind. According to Weber, for instance, in the times of the Old Synagogue, God had come to be regarded as so far transcendent that a mediating being, the *Memra Adonai*, or the Word of the Lord, had to be introduced to connect Him with the world. The Word of the Lord, mentioned in certain psalms and elsewhere, is to be equated with the Johannine *Logos*. The sole originality of the author would consist in uniting the idea of the Word of God with another Jewish conception, namely, that of the pre-existent Messiah, such pre-existence, moreover, being assumed to be from before all worlds. The factual foundation of both of these assumptions the work of Strack-Billerbeck seems to me effectively to demolish. The older Judaism believed neither in a concrete Word nor in an eternally pre-existent Messiah. Let us glance for a moment at their argument.

Is it true that the Old Synagogue conceived of the *Memra Adonai* as a mediating being between God and the world? If so, why is it that in the Targums, the Aramaic translations of the Hebrew Old Testament, the Hebrew *dabar*, or word, is not translated by the Aramaic *Memra* in just those passages where it would be especially called for? On the contrary, *dabar* is almost everywhere translated by *pithgam* or *pithgama*, which is *word* in the ordinary acceptance of the term. In one instance, in Psalm 147, in the passage, "who sendeth his Word upon earth," *dabar* of the Hebrew is translated not by *Memra*, but by *imratho*, the common term for spoken word. The Aramaic translators use Lord and Word, *Adonai* and *Memra*, more or less interchangeably. It is now the Lord, and now his Word which takes a hand in human history. Evidently, then, the second is only a synonym for the first. *Memra*, like *Adonai*, is just a circumlocution for the personal divine name of Yahweh or Jehovah, which a Jew no longer dared to pronounce. In brief, the Word of the Lord in Judaism has no point of connection, apart from the name, with the *Logos* of John. The Jewish prototype of the latter must be sought elsewhere.

The second assumption of the older scholarship, that the Jewish Messiah was a divine being, or even that he was eternally pre-existent, is equally unfounded. For, in all the manifold Messianic conceptions of Jewry, the Messiah never exceeded human qualities and status. Frequently he was merely some ancient hero, such as Joshua or Merahem, brought back to earthly leadership and life. When one carefully analyzes the passages

in Jewish literature which Schuerer, Dalman, Hahn, Edersheim and others believed to support the idea of the pre-existence of the Messiah, it becomes evident that such pre-existence was not real, but only ideal, that is, pre-existence merely in the mind and plan of God. (The exception would be the case of the few Jews who believed the Platonic doctrine of the eternal pre-existence of all souls.) Pre-existence in the plan of God is all that can be gathered out of such a passage as Enoch 48. 6: "He (the Messianic Son of man) was chosen and hidden before God ere the world was made." Or, "Before the sun and the signs of the Zodiac were created, before the stars of heaven were made, his name was named before the Lord of Spirits" (Enoch 48. 3). Or, finally, as in the Septuagint of Psalm 110. 3, "Out of thy mother's bosom have I begotten thee before the morning star." When the Messiah is spoken of as taken up alive into heaven and there concealed until the day of his appearing, pre-existence of course is predicated, but it is pre-existence in history and not pre-existence before all worlds. In brief, the characteristic Johannine conception of an eternal Word, who is also Messiah, cannot be derived whence older rabbinical authorities thought it could be. Judaism believed neither in a hypostatic Word nor in an eternally pre-existent Messiah.

Are there other ideas in the older Judaism which could serve as a background and basis for the *Word* of John? Here an affirmative answer is possible. The conception of the Torah (or the Law) as eternally pre-existent in the mind of God, and the conception of Wisdom in the Wisdom literature are such. These ideas, rather than that of a Messiah whose name is eternally known to God, would form the real analogue to the gospel *Logos*. Indeed, Torah and Wisdom are frequently equated in the post-Christian Jewish literature, and the attributes of one freely applied to the other. To quote three characteristic passages: "Seven things were created before the world, namely, the Torah, Repentance, the Garden of Eden, the Throne of the Majesty, Gehenna, the Sanctuary and the name of the Messiah" (Pes. 54a Bar). "Seven things preceded the world by 2,000 years, the Torah, the Throne of the Majesty, the Garden of Eden, Repentance, Gehenna, the upper Sanctuary and the name of the Messiah. On what was the Torah written? With black fire on white fire, and it lay on God's knee, while he sat on the throne of the Majesty" (Midrasch on Psalm 90. 12). "Jehovah created me (Wisdom-Torah) as the beginning of his way, the earliest of his works" (Proverbs 8. 22).

Thus, in spite of its far remove from the primitive Messianism of the early apostolic church and the low Christology of Jewish Christian sects

for centuries after, the high Christology of John can find all its materials in Judaism alone. In the pre-existent entities of the Law and of Wisdom, and in the conception of a Messiah eternally foreknown of God, the author of John, as well as Paul before him, have a sufficient foundation for their Christological conceptions. The Logos-Messiah of the gospel is only another name, after all, for the divine Christ of the Pauline epistles. Both have the same cosmic and soteriological function. Indeed, to Christian piety brought up on the Pauline epistles, the Synoptic Gospels, in spite of their marked advance on primitive Messianism, must have seemed inadequate. Our Fourth Gospel was actually the response to an imperative demand of Christian feeling regarding the Savior. Whatever may have been the influence of stoicism or of the mystery religions on other parts of Paul's theology (and here it is easy to exaggerate), his ideas of Christ are based solidly on previous Jewish conceptions interpreted by his own conversion, reflection and spiritual experience. No matter how far Paul and John may be from the original Christology of Peter, both can be explained without recourse to Hellenistic philosophy or Oriental syncretism. Given Paul our gospel was inevitable. It is the gospel of Pauline Christology.

Among the numerous evidences of the Jewish orientation of the Fourth Gospel is the language of the Greek text itself. Granted a good knowledge of Greek and one or two Semitic tongues, the conclusion is difficult to avoid that our author was a Semite. Whoever the author, he writes as a Jew would write to whom Greek was not a native tongue. The contention made in various quarters (as by Deismann in *Bible Studies*) that the peculiarities of so-called Semitic Greek are the peculiarities of Hellenistic Greek in general, does not seem to me to be relevant. For the parallels adduced are usually drawn from the Egyptian Greek of the papyri. And Egyptian, after all, is Semitic, if not to any large extent in vocabulary, at least in structure. The Semitisms of John may stand as a testimony to its Semitic authorship, both in Prologue and subsequent story.

The basis of our gospel is solidly Jewish. There is no cogent reason for believing that its Christology, or any other of its characteristic ideas except, perhaps, its intellectual mysticism, are not a development within the limits of Christianity itself. Given Paul, John, with all his differences, follows. Our author, I take it, was a Jewish Christian mystic of the intellectualistic sort, who, nevertheless, owed little to the Greeks and much to the Hebrews, particularly to that Hebrew of the Hebrews, Saul of Tarsus.

## The Three Kinds of Atheism

PRESTON W. SLOSSON

**“Y**OU don't believe in the Devil? Why, you little atheist!” said a scandalized old lady to a bold little girl. This is merely a comically extreme instance of the difficulties we fall into when we use terms without giving definitions. The existence, power, and benevolence of God is the central affirmation of all Christian theology, and yet everyone is an atheist by someone else's definition. The early Christians were prosecuted for “atheism” because they denied the plurality of gods; to-day a pagan who denied the unity of God would probably win the same label. Is the Episcopalian Deity, “without body, parts or passions,” satisfactory to the orthodox Mormon, whose creed teaches the physical and bodily existence of God? Are Calvin's Enlightened Despot of the Heavens, Kant's Moral Ordainer, Bergson's Vital Impetus, Hegel's Absolute, Spinoza's monistic God-Universe, Voltaire's absentee First Cause, Arnold's Power that Makes for Righteousness, and Billy Sunday's rowdy Jehovah all one and the same reality? If we grant so much, shall we stretch the bounds a little farther to admit Spencer's Unknowable, Comte's Humanity, Haeckel's Nature, and the “Spirit of Progress” of the agnostic humanitarian?

The difficulty is a serious one. If the boundary between theism and atheism is drawn too straitly it leaves without many people who in denying God are in reality denying only traditional religious imagery which represented God as an irascible, white-bearded old gentleman specializing in arbitrary miracles; the “acts of God” of the insurance companies. We are all victims to some extent of that imagery. Even to the most sophisticated theologian, who knows that it is barbaric to speak of the sex of Deity, the remark of the feminist leader to her daughter, “Pray to God, my dear, and She will hear you!” sounds more absurd than if the masculine pronoun were used. And yet if the boundary be not drawn somewhere, there is no use in speaking of theism or atheism at all. For what atheist is not ready to affirm “the unity of the universe” or “the laws of nature” or “the spirit of love between man and man”? Surely the Fundamentalist is right when he objects to the way in which the more sentimental sort of liberal escapes from a clear issue in a fog of phrases.

Our best course is not to attempt a final definition of Deity, for any such definition would be a battleground of controversy, but more modestly to seek a purely pragmatic test, a sort of “greatest common denominator”



among rival definitions. Let us grant that *all* which God can mean has never been discovered yet, even by the greatest sages and saints. After a million years, scattered among a thousand lives, the best of us may in some distant world begin to comprehend a little of that meaning. But unless we can agree on a minimum, on the *least* that "God" can mean, we might as well say "X" or "Jabberwock" or drop theology altogether and cultivate our merely human gardens like good agnostics! Now, what seems to me the least that a theist can affirm without belying his name is that ours is, in the main, a *planned* universe. There is will, intention, creation in it. Whether we go on from that point and affirm that this will must imply a person, or say that God must be "above personality," is a matter for metaphysical debate. The essential thing is that God must not be *less* than personal; we should not misuse the term as a mere equivalent for an unconscious and purposeless "Fate" or "Natural Law." Specifically Christian theology must go at least one step farther and insist that this will or purpose is "good"; that is, it has some relation to our human values. We will not worship the lazy gods of Epicurus, who picnic on Olympus and let the universe wag as it will without their help. Still less will we worship an evil Moloch delighting in atrocities and misgoverning the universe. Every pessimist is an atheist, for an evil God is as little to be revered as no God at all, and the only manly attitude toward such a Deity is one of Promethean defiance. This is not to deny the possibility that God may, for reasons which we do not understand, permit the existence of much apparent evil in the universe, or even that much real evil may exist which God cannot prevent; it is merely to deny that He can will what is really evil. This is common ground to all the Christian sects, and, indeed, to all the prophetic religions.

Beyond this common ground I do not, for the present, wish to step. Whether God be or be not omnipotent; whether he operate solely by general laws or sometimes intervene with special miracles; whether his nature be unitary or triune; such points as these divide theists into rival religious camps but they do not divide the theist from the atheist. On which side of the line will stand the pantheist, the monist, the man to whom God and the universe are at one? Our pragmatic test will serve us here once more. The self-contemplative Deity of Buddha or Spinoza is less a God of will—less an Occidental—than the actively creative God of Moses, Mohammed or Luther; but, if the world be only his dream, the Dreamer at least must be real. But the pantheism which merely gives a capital N to Nature and adds no spiritual interpretation to the blind play of matter

and motion is merely monistic atheism. Whether the world be one or many is a very interesting problem in metaphysics but it is far from the central problem of religion. *That* problem cannot be better phrased than it was by Browning: is the world a "blot or blank," or does it "mean intensely and mean good"?

Atheism, then, is merely the denial that any intention, value or significance exists in the universe other than that which we mortals choose to invent for our own human purposes. That this denial may be combined in many cases with loftiest standards of conduct and aspiration after human values is unquestionable. The atheist is even entitled to say, if he chooses, that his is the more heroic course; that it is braver to be good in a cosmos which has no mind or will to care whether we be good or not than to fight with the whole invisible forces of the universe at one's back. The noble stoicism of a Bertrand Russell in the face of expected annihilation of the individual, of the whole human race, of all organic life, and of the whole system of ethical values created by man, ought surely to win him a seat of honor in the kingdom of Heaven if, to his intense amazement, there should turn out to be such a place after all. But as nobody wants to be hopeless merely to exhibit his fortitude, the question arises as to why any have adopted the bleak conclusions of atheism.

Those who explicitly deny or tacitly ignore the existence of God can, I think, be grouped into three types: the philosophical atheist, the political atheist, and the practical atheist. The philosophical atheist is the only type we usually hear discussed and is the only type I have thus far discussed in this paper. He is a rare bird, but not quite an extinct one. A few leading men of science, such as Ernst Haeckel and Jacques Loeb, must certainly be so classed; a somewhat larger group of metaphysicians, such as Bertrand Russell and Friedrich Nietzsche; and a sizable crowd of journalists, poets and literary folk, ranging all the way from the ardent idealist Shelley<sup>1</sup> to the pedestrian cynic Mencken. Usually, especially among men of science, atheism is merely a corollary of a materialistic or mechanistic theory; sometimes, indeed, as among the Behaviorists, the consequence of erecting a methodology into a metaphysics. The universe is a self-contained piece of clockwork requiring no creator to make it, sustain it, or justify it; as the French astronomer said, when asked if his science included a Deity, "We have no need of that hypothesis." Sometimes, however, theoretical atheism is the outburst of a too sensitive heart or an unhappy personal

<sup>1</sup> Of course I refer to the juvenile Shelley who wrote "The Necessity of Atheism"; the poems of his maturity show an increasingly spiritual interpretation of the universe that verges on theism.

experience that seems to blacken the heavens. This seems certainly to have been the case with Mark Twain in the bitter essays of his extreme old age, and this view has found its most perfect expression in James Thomson's *City of Dreadful Night*:

As if a Being, God or Fiend, could reign,  
At once so wicked, foolish, and insane,  
As to produce men when He might refrain!

Curiously enough, the atheism which springs from an emotional revolt is really more logical than that which springs from an intellectual system. For the completest imaginable explanation of everything in terms of natural law, even if it were possible, would still leave as open as ever the question: Are these laws self-existent or the expression of a divine will? If the world be made in six days out of nothing or in six billion years from a cloud of star dust; if man be made by sudden fiat in the garden of Eden or slowly evolve by using his wits to cope with mastodons and glaciers through a thousand ages, what does it matter? The question is not one of process but one of product. If the world and man as we know them to-day are too wonderful to be accidental it is no solution to the enigma merely to label the steps of their evolution. As well might one argue: "No will or intelligence went into the painting of what you call a masterpiece. The whole process was natural and physical from beginning to end. Did I not see a brush of wood and hair dipped in certain pigments—which I have carefully analyzed into their elements—and spread on a white canvas? I can assure you, as an eyewitness, that nothing else occurred!" All true. All irrelevant.

But the objection of the pessimist, though probably untrue, is not irrelevant. He says, in effect, "Your so-called masterpiece is but a daub. Your wonderful universe is a den of misery. Man is but the most dangerous of beasts and his intellect is merely cunning sharpened by greed. It would be blasphemy to imagine an intelligent and benevolent Being responsible for such a botched piece of work. It must have been a mere accidental by-product of cosmic energies if not, indeed, of cosmic decay!"

The logic of this is sound enough. A world not worth creating may conceivably be a world not created. But very few people, and usually not the wisest and sanest, find life completely void of value. Moreover, pessimism is often merely the disillusionment of a sensitive idealist whose real error lay in expecting too much; and a subconscious optimism underlies his conscious cynicism. He does not see that in a great measure his ideals

refute their own disillusionment. In a thoroughly wicked or meaningless cosmos how could even the most confiding of men have expected human relations to be guided by virtue and wisdom? Why this tragic surprise at being cheated if honesty were not the general rule? If we are all selfish beings, why should the pessimist curse God or break his heart over any sufferings except those which injure his personal health and prosperity? Ideals do not spring from nowhere: if they come from experience, then there must be much good in the world after all, if they come from outside experience where can we look for their author if not to God? God thus sternly expelled from the universe in his capacity as creator returns to it—as critic!

Very much commoner than his more distinguished brother the philosophical atheist is the political atheist. He has not spent his nights searching the heavens in vain for God through the telescope of science nor spent his days pouring over Schopenhauer in the library of philosophy. He has not even broken his heart over a personal tragedy or the woes inflicted by nature on the whole human race. In fact, he has “no time for philosophy”; it isn’t “practical.” But he hates the church, as an institution, and is thus ready to take for granted that whatever it teaches must be false. Can anyone doubt that if the Orthodox Church in Russia had been a militantly rebel body, persecuted by atheistic Tsars, that communistic Russia of to-day would be Orthodox and view atheism with suspicion as “aristocratic” (which, in fact, Robespierre once called it!) or, at all events, “bourgeois”? But, since the established church was, in fact, anti-revolutionary, religion must be “the opiate of the people,” to be kept in check by anti-narcotic laws. Nor is Russia the sole instance. The privileged position of the Roman Catholic clergy in eighteenth-century France drove the reformers into the simple Deism of Robespierre’s “Supreme Being” or the atheism of Hébert’s “Reason.” In Ireland during the same period most of the rebels boasted their loyalty to the Catholic faith because it was the symbol of resistance to the oppression of Protestant England. In seventeenth-century Scotland the grimmest form of Calvinism became dear to the peasantry because it was persecuted by the more latitudinarian Stuarts. The whirligig of political change may make *any* established faith hated if the government with which it is identified becomes unpopular.

Political atheism is, of course, wholly irrational. If Christianity had been founded to enslave the working class, as the cruder sort of Socialist often asserts, it would have been reserved for the high-born. Christ would have been incarnate as a great prince instead of as a carpenter’s apprentice.

His disciples would have been nobles and millionaires, not fishermen. The doctrines of the faith, instead of being preached to everyone, would have been reserved for an inner circle of the illuminati, as was indeed the case with practically every cult in the Roman decadence *except* the Christian! Scriptures would have been chosen which did not teem with "woe unto—" the rich, prosperous and successful. God would not have "exalted the humble" nor "cast down the mighty." Really, old Nietzsche was nearer right in his fantastic notion that Christianity was a conspiracy of oppressed Jews to enmesh their Roman conquerors in a religion which would blunt their swords and break their power! In answer to this, it is sometimes urged that the very democratic character of Christianity is an aid to the oppressor because it consoles the oppressed with the vision of a future life where all wrongs will be righted. Other worldly hopes become thus a substitute for revolutionary action. As if a man who believed himself a cherished son of God and heir to immortal life would be less apt to stand on his rights even in temporal matters than a man who believed himself merely an unlucky animal governed by luckier ones! The Christian nations and the Christian ages have been the most revolutionary in the world's history. Indeed, is it not a common taunt that the professed disciples of the meek and humble Nazarene have been the fiercest warriors and conquerors the earth has ever known?

But we cannot dismiss the political atheist merely because he is pathetically ignorant of history and lacks the capacity for speculative thought of the philosophical atheist. He is numbered by the million where the theoretical materialist is numbered by the hundred. And if his complaint against Christian theology has no weight, his complaint against the conduct of the Christian churches should cause us all to pause and reflect. Why are most of the socialists, trade-unionists and other radicals in such countries as Mexico, Spain, France, Germany and Russia either indifferent or actively hostile toward the churches? Can it be entirely explained as mere impatience or misunderstanding, or have the church organizations permitted themselves to be used as tools of reaction? Did not the state churches in eighteenth-century France and in twentieth-century Russia precipitate their own downfall? What was the attitude of the Popes toward Italian unity? How have the English bishops in the House of Lords usually reacted toward social reform and political enfranchisement? The conclusion is as irresistible as it is deplorable: the political conservatism of the established churches, whether or not justified in itself, has been a major cause in spreading atheism among the underprivileged.



Our third and last type of atheist, the most numerous of all, is not usually reckoned as such. Indeed, he is not an atheist in the theoretical sense at all, and it is to his practical attitude and not to his formal creed that we must look to justify our classification. He is the man who may think he believes but never acts as if he believed. This does not mean that he is necessarily a conscienceless scoundrel. He may be a very respectable pagan, but he is the man whose conduct would not be altered by a hair's breadth if all his opinions were turned topsy-turvey. Sometimes he occupies the front pew at church, though he is more apt to rent it and leave it vacant! He has given us such maxims as "business is business," "look out for number one," "there is no golden rule in practical politics," "my country, right or wrong." Each of these statements is a negation of God. If God exists and it really *matters* whether he exists or not, business, politics, and diplomacy fall as distinctly under his will as does church going. Of course, a true believer may be a sinner, but at least he is conscious of being a sinner. The everyday pagan, the practical atheist, is sublimely unconscious that there is anything amiss in conducting the practical affairs of life with no reference to religion. If he behaves well, as he sometimes does, it is because he "wants to be a gentleman," or because "people in our set don't *do* such things," or because "honesty is the best policy." But if you say to him "such conduct is unchristian," or "how can you reconcile your actions with what you say you believe?" he will glare at you and mutter something uncomplimentary about "cant." He will even say that he has "too much reverence" to be "dragging his religion into private affairs." He is half of us all the time and all of us about half the time, and he is the real problem before the pulpit.

# Understanding the Common People

ROBERT R. WICKS

IN one of his letters the apostle Paul used a phrase which a modern translation has significantly rendered "the sense of what is vital." In a changing world there is always a part of life which is being outlived and a part which is just becoming alive. There are dead spots where outgrown interests are losing their hold, and live spots where irresistible, vital interests are breaking out in new directions, keeping the world alive and growing. To have the sense to distinguish between the quick and the dead is what one might mean by the sense of what is vital. It is the religious sense to discern where God is at work on the growing edge of the world's life.

Education ought to develop this. But it has had a long-standing reputation for not doing so. Benjamin Kidd, you remember, once said that all the reforms that made for better life for the people in England were originally opposed by the educated and cultured people. When it was discovered in the mental tests made during the war that class A minds were very rare, and class C and D minds were very common, the editor of *The Nation* remarked that we need not worry; class A minds were most often used to resist the necessary social changes, while class D minds were more social in their bent and could therefore be of just as great importance in saving the nations.

The outstanding peril in our time is the multitude of educated people clinging to an outlived world. They are living with opinions that are fast proving helpless to cope with our problems. They are depending on leadership which the war and this depression have utterly discredited. They are insisting on beliefs that are losing their reality over larger and larger areas of life. They have settled down in this outlived world, dug themselves in—afraid, panicky, prejudiced—and are blindly opposed to any change that might upset their ways. They want a better world, but none of the changes that may make it. These people who do not want the world to move are as dangerous as the people who want it to move too fast. They create the desperation which they deplore. The violence of the radical is the direct outgrowth of the inertia of intelligent people who fail to sense where the world is dying and where it is becoming alive.

Consider the kind of knowledge which, just now, is required for developing this sense of what is vital. It is knowledge of the feelings of the common people. The other day I stopped to talk with the boss of a road gang. He was a fighting Irishman. "Things is getting worse and

worse," he said. "Think of working men losing their jobs and then being evicted from their homes because they cannot pay their rent or the interest on their mortgage. If I was in that state and they tried to take my little home away, it would be over my dead body, and don't you forget it." Thoughts and feelings inside people like that are the most vital factors in our situation. Where the pressure of their life is being felt to-day is the focal point of the world's growth and change. Millions of these people are still at work, but in daily fear that some unelected authority, owning the machinery, will tell them, without notice, when they may not work. Millions have been living for years in an industrial system that condemned them to the fear of employing power which could discharge at will and discard entirely in time of old age. We have all been accustomed to using these people and tossing them aside at our convenience. And now at last their day has come. It is their feelings and thoughts and power that concern everybody. During fourteen years in an industrial city, going into the homes of the well-to-do one day and into the tenements of their employees the next, it was always impressed upon me how little the people uptown really understood the feelings of the people below Main Street. An increase in that understanding of the common people is essential to a sense of what is vital.

Just where does acquaintance with common people cultivate the sense of what is dying out and coming to life in the world?

For one thing, among common people one can sense the irresistible movement toward partnership in work. The great bulk of business leadership to-day is living in the dying world of industrial autocracy. The autocrat in banking and industrial circles, and our highest officials still think the problems are to be solved by their brains alone. Note how often they arrange most of their commissions and conferences with no one to represent the point of view of the common man. They think that he has not enough intelligence. On the lower levels that may be so; but ordinary people are doing hard thinking these days, and whatever their ideas may be, their feelings are a critical factor in all our problems.

The younger leaders in industry who are nearer to the workers are becoming more sensitive to this necessity for partnership instead of dominance. The personnel director in one of our largest corporations said to me that you do not find this sensitiveness to human feelings in the old leaders at the top (with exceptions, of course), but you do find it becoming acute among the second assistants, who are closer to the people. This depression has magnified on a huge scale the significance of the drift toward

partnership in life. Workers have seen themselves, as never before, essential to the world of work. Their buying power, determined by their wages, is necessary to world recovery. They have seen the world wrecked by a business policy conducted as a game for the profit of a few instead of for the good of all who work in it.

As we come near to the feelings of these people we discover that this consciousness of partnership is becoming a living thing in the world to-day. It means that the daily round of man's labor must become more a mutual enterprise and less the manipulation of a grab-bag for men at the top and stockholders at a distance. Right there God is bringing us nearer to the ideal of Him who said, "The Gentiles lord it over one another, but it shall not be so among you." Here is one place where the love of God is alive and at work in the world.

Again, here in the feelings of the common people one can sense a movement beyond charity. It is one thing to read about this in books, but another matter to meet it in life. There is a reason why the Russians picked on Christian charity as a hateful thing: it had been made a substitute for justice. I had a first-hand experience of that the other day when an American communist came to my door asking for something to eat. He was as keen and intelligent a young Irishman as I have met in a long day. Seventy-five per cent of the men in college could not hold their own with the knowledge he had of history, economic theories and of what is going on in the world. And he knew the common people. He had hitch-hiked from Ohio and had talked with the distressed and desperate all along the route. He had felt the pulse of humanity where it was most feverish. As he ate, we talked. He told me he was sleeping in an old shed in the neighborhood. I offered to pay for a night's lodging, but he wanted no charity. "Well," I said, "mow the lawn and I will pay you." He offered to mow the lawn for the meal I had given him, but I urged him to take the money for a night's lodging. "All right," he said, "but if you do not mind I shall sleep in the shed and use the money for a hair-cut and a bath and some letter-paper to write for some jobs." So I took him back to his shed in my car, and there we talked on. "You see," he said, "I have to take food when I cannot earn it, but I do not want to take any charity from people who support the system. I want to fight the system that squeezes men out of work and makes them beggars, puts them on a dole, kills their self-respect." He went on to say that the upper classes were still clinging to the old idea of charity as the solution of our problems. They have sympathy for those out of work, subscribe to drives for relief to keep the people from starving and becoming

rebels in our midst. They will be charitable, but they will not get down to the root of the matter. They fear attempts to reorganize the world of work and finance so that the people who are necessary for its success will not be dependent on charity and dread old age, but have resources to sustain themselves in their own right.

This man may be extreme, but his revolt against charity as a substitute for original justice is the dominant feeling in the lives of common people to-day. Yet our major parties and the majority of our people are still thinking of this depression in terms of relief. Outside the smallest political party there seems to be almost no courage to face a real change in the system which has brought on this distress and, if unchanged, will do it again. Fancy how the feelings of the common people must grow desperate when they read reports of the racketeering of so-called financial leaders such as the moving-picture magnates who, by manipulating newspaper reports, were able to sell to ignorant victims the stock of their own company, only to buy it all back from a low level at a seven million dollar profit; or like a great electric power magnate who built up a billion-dollar syndicate, exploited for profit one of the great natural necessities, made a hundred million, gave much to charity and philanthropy, and then lost control of his Frankenstein and swept everybody with him into a disaster that left him personally two hundred million dollars in debt. We cannot afford to continue an order of living that allows one level of society to play with the nation's wealth while a revolt against charity is growing on another level.

What a different feeling arises when one reads, for instance, of the growing movement to substitute old-age pensions for commitment of aged people to the almshouse. Did you ever hear working people, as they grow old, talk about their dread of the poor house after a life of honest toil? How would it sound to you, if you were in their places, to learn that two years ago there were only 4,000 aged people in three states with pensions; and now, before this year is over, there will be 102,000 in thirteen states rescued from the poor house, with hope rekindled. And the average cost of this is a little over half of the cost of running the almshouses. Such social engineering has its dangers, but it is indicative of where the world is becoming alive to the need of justice before charity. If Jesus were to stand in the midst of all this, we know the words he would utter once again: Woe unto you hypocrites, for ye have given to charity your tithe of mint and annis and cummin, and have left undone the weightier matters of the law, justice and mercy and faith. In that utterance you find something of what He meant by the love of God in an eternal revolt against injustice.



Again, among common people one grows sensitive to a new faith. At first it sounds utterly irreligious. That man at my door spoke the vernacular of this new faith, which is characteristic of vast portions of the working people who are becoming alienated from conventional religion. When he learned that I was a minister, he said, "You will have to pardon me for speaking frankly, but I am anti-religious. You people talk easily about a kind, loving God, like a father who will take care of us and protect us. If you lived where I do and met the people I meet, you would grow bitter as gall over that sort of talk. What good would it do for millions of people on the edge of starvation to-day to pray for help from that God? You can hold that sort of belief when you are comfortable and have what you need, but there is no supernatural help for the working people to do what we have to do ourselves. We must trust science to get at the resources of the universe, and we must organize industry to distribute those resources to everybody. We must require a better material basis for life so that more people can rise above mere material interests to more spiritual interests, where life is richer and more satisfying. We put our trust in economic determinism, which can be depended on to move the world out of the rut in which it wants to stay. Your whole church paraphernalia seems to be designed to make comfortable people feel more so."

It reminded me of an article in the *Christian Century*, one of a series of conversations about God, by two theological professors and a philosophical atheist—a rampant atheist who had revolted from a rigid fundamentalism. The atheist argued that we are turning from a religious technique to a non-religious technique. In the physical realm, science is teaching us how to handle the resources of nature, abandoning supernatural miracles. We are going in for scientific miracles to make better health, better crops, better organization of life all around. And we are better off than when men depended on prayer wheels and icons and shrines. And now in the realm of values and character we are learning to lift the moral level by understanding heredity, mental and physical health, the influence of environment, education and economic opportunity. No supernatural influence is invoked, for right within humanity is the driving power. He calls it by different names: "an idealizing movement that sends men on a search for a better manner of living," "a deep-going hunger," "an innate bent for more significant life," "an incurable spiritual aspiration is the vital force working in man's upward striving." There you are; a new faith put into irreligious terms. But there is something there that sounds a good deal like one who said that the kingdom of God is within you. Here is something that

is quite akin to what Christians have always talked about as the Holy Spirit working in the human race toward the higher ends of life. This secularization of life may be the preliminary to a real religious revival. It may be the discarding of an outgrown expression of religion that was acting as an opiate on people. It may be a new approach to understanding the love of God. For what is the love of God like? I believe it is like this passionate earnestness, working through men in all branches of science, to understand the forces God has given the universe and to make them available for life. I believe it is like this incurable concern for more significant life for every individual down to the lowest in society. I believe it is like the self-less sympathy that takes hold on a man such as Eugene Debbs and makes him say, "While there is a man in prison, I am not free." I believe it is like the deadly earnestness that is back of economic determinism, acting like an earthquake to unsettle in the long run every way of life that is based on sheer selfishness. I believe it is like that great inclusive power that weaves all lives together and uses all for each and each for all. It was this kind of love to which Jesus tried to give us the clue in the way he lived and taught. And this secularizing movement in the world may well go on until this real love of God captures the hearts of men and leads them to share life with the whole race.

Our education in schools and colleges needs closer contact with these realities that are alive among the common people. The pressure that is to change the world will come from common people, but that pressure needs to be connected with men of trained intelligence. It was a Princeton graduate who set the Socialist convention shouting approval when he opposed an extremist's program for public ownership by confiscation. With sheer force of intelligence he turned that tide until only twenty-nine voted for a course which would lead to violence and bloodshed.

We are in a crisis as ominous as the war and we cannot hide behind some exclusive idea of culture. Our educational institutions should be furnishing more lawyers who would devote themselves to the fight of the people instead of the defense of racketeering corporations; more writers who would voice the romance and tragedy of the people instead of the futilities of the pampered and overindulged in high society; more bankers and business men who would concern themselves with people before profits; more men in politics who would represent the real issues of the people. In our institutions of learning there should be joint groups of faculty and students, as serious about this as we were about the war, trying to make closer contact with the struggles of the common people.

# The Spiritual Base of Human Society

JAMES M. STIFLER

**I**T is noteworthy that amid the confusion of our present social situation and the many remedies that are being offered so far no commanding voice has been heard to the effect that the cure of our present financial and political ills is to be found in the area of religion.

This is a serious indictment of the organized religion of our day and one that should not be neglected by religious persons. I shall not attempt to add to that indictment but I shall attempt to find whether the implied indictment is just and whether we have in organized religion anything to which we may look with hope for relief from the kind of social disorder which now prevails. I am convinced that we shall find that such a hope is reasonable but that religion has fallen far behind its obligations in the field of ethics. Furthermore I am soundly convinced that it is entirely within the resources of the Christian Church to proclaim and teach its tenets in so clear and persuasive a way that such confusion as we now see in human society shall be greatly mitigated.

I do not think that the Bible or the minister has any message to bankers or to employers of labor or to judges or to legislators or educators on the particular technique of their occupation, but I do think that the Bible has something to say to each of them as a man. The most infantile blunder that modern society has been making is its habitual separation of business and humanity, of banking and humanity, of manufacturing and humanity. The jurist who puts legal processes first and human beings second, the legislator who puts his party or his job first and humanity second is socially as childish as a cook who prepares a meal for its looks and forgets that it was meant to be eaten.

All this may sound nonsensical to one who has heard all his life that in business profits come ahead of anything else. One quite admits that a business cannot exist without profits, but any business that makes profits by impoverishing human beings or by dishonesty in any way isn't a business. It's a racket, a steal. Real business is as honorable and dignified, it is as essential as any occupation on earth. The way in which the production and sale of goods is carried on by true men of affairs is as honest as can be imagined. The management of entrusted funds which is essentially the occupation of the banker is all that the word trust implies. Our lives daily depend on the faithfulness and skill with which architects and draughtsmen

have planned our buildings and the honesty with which the steel worker, the concrete mixer, the mason, the electrical engineer, the sanitary engineer have done their work.

We travel on railroads in great safety. Last year our railroads carried passengers 26,875,642 miles, during which time only fifty-four persons lost their lives by accident. I doubt if so many persons could walk that far with fewer accidents.

We contemplate a trip across the ocean with no more apprehension of drowning than we would if we were rowing across a mill pond. Yet our safety when traveling by land or sea is entirely due to the skill, the honesty, the honor and, in case of danger, the almost invariable devotion and self-sacrifice of rail men and sea men.

We go to a hospital and place ourselves unreservedly in the hands of a physician, take an anesthetic which renders us entirely helpless, and we never for a moment fear that the surgeon will abuse our trust.

There are vast areas of social life that are safe and wholesome. They are made so in every case by the honesty and dependability, often the unselfishness and devotion to ideals, of the men and women who work in those areas. There are no breakdowns where the spiritual ideals of an occupation are sound. We do not suddenly have to boycott the railroads because we fear they will kill us. Some things are established in our confidence because of the character of the men who operate them.

But there is a panic in the area of industry and banking; it extends to the area of government as well. One must not throw accusations right and left. I am convinced that most of the men in our financial and industrial circles are honest and dependable. I am also convinced that the basic cause of our present confusion is a lack of moral integrity in too many of them. When the time comes that industry, banking, and politics have in general the same ethical standards that prevail with the physician and the ship captain we shall have no more such social experiences as we are now having.

It is a commonplace that a given article when purchased for a city government costs from two to four times as much as when bought by an individual or private concern. Yet those things are bought with trust funds. The message of President Hoover accompanying his veto of a bill passed by Congress for aid of alleged veterans stated the facts about many of these cases and the revelation of them was enough to nauseate an intelligent citizen with a congress of men who for any reason under heaven would vote for such a bill. Such action on the part of a representative of the

people amounts to flagrant breach of trust but so dull is our conscience in such matters that we raise no protest. We *expect* robbery of public funds.

Why need one go further? The suicide of Kreuger and others, the arrest and trial of so many bankers, the revelations as to methods of financing many apartment house projects, the quiet retirement of various citizens once prominent in financial circles, are an indictment of our common ethical standards. Few of us, I fear, are in a position to call any particular kettle black. There is scarce a great city in America where the people, the taxpayers, have not suffered from a dulled moral sense. We have allowed a situation to develop where every four citizens are supporting a fifth person at the public expense, we groan under taxes that mount higher and higher and an extravagance only more cruel than it is bewildering. Washington is ridden by lobbies whose whole purpose is the securing of special privilege for special groups. Our tariff, that may have once been a necessity, has been ballooned up to a preposterous machine for enriching certain groups of our citizens who fatten contentedly while the nation as a whole gathers a harvest of international ill will and ultimately pays and pays bitterly for the benefits granted to a favored few.

Stranger than this is the sedulous development of a false, an overheated nationalism which flies into self-righteous fury when anyone suggests that some things in our national life are desperately wrong and cry to heaven for a change.

If one points to the 85 per cent of our national income that goes for wars past and to come and advocates definite measures for the abatement of war he is by this group dubbed a pacifist, a menace to his country, and it is often hinted that he is probably in the pay of Moscow. If he ventures to say that our country's welfare depends at all on the welfare of other nations and that we should take our place in a council of nations he is suspected of being a dangerous "red" or at least has leanings that way. And woe betide the man who ventures to insist that the Constitution of the United States really grants the right of free speech to all citizens, and tries to exercise his constitutional guarantee. If he ventures to say anything that is not in the credo of the hundred percenters he is lucky if he escapes with harsh words only.

All this, too, in a day when we are reaping such a harvest of sorrow from the policies that have prevailed for so long. There is nothing in the product of the past decade of American life that would make a rational man want to repeat it. One of the admitted leaders in Chicago's affairs, a man nationally known, said to me recently, "We need a change, many



changes, real changes, yet if I say so publicly I am at once called a Bolshevik by one group and hailed as a convert by destructive fellows at the other end of the string."

I suggest that there is a change that can be made that will surely accomplish a vast betterment and that will not subject anyone to any danger of being falsely classified. There is no economic system that will work well for the mass of men while the men who live under it and operate it are greedy, indifferent to suffering, lawless, and dishonest. There is no form of government that can work well unless the men who operate it regard it as a trust and conduct their affairs with a high sense of responsibility to all the people. If a considerable part of our population were not men of honor and trustworthy we should not now be doing even as well as we are.

I should say that the one need of our nation at this moment is a very greatly quickened moral sense. May I give one illustration? One cannot contemplate the English courts to-day without a feeling that they have tremendous moral assets. "If you commit a crime in England," says Andre Maurois, in his advice to a young Frenchman going to England, "you will be punished. It is almost a certainty." Baron Kysant, of Carmarthen, who could trace his ancestry back to Vortigern, King of the Britons, was the virtual owner of not less than ten great steamship lines. He issued misleading statements to his stockholders and published a prospectus that was not entirely true. Though he was a peer of the realm, the English courts sent him to the penitentiary. Imagine here in America jailing a multimillionaire ship owner for issuing a misleading prospectus! Here we would likely say that the people who bought his stuff were poor sports and poor losers. In an English court a dishonest intent is dishonesty and punished as such and the guilty do not escape on legal technicalities.

This type of sensitive conscience is the only hope of any civilization and the producing of sensitive consciences is the business of religion. Do you remember the picture Daniel gives of the great statue with a head of gold, breast and arms of silver, belly and thighs of brass, its legs of iron and its feet part of iron and part of clay. Call to mind then that he used it as an illustration of a government that could not stand because it was weak at its base. The same principle is involved in Jesus' parable of the house built on sand. "No nation," said Mr. Lincoln, "can long endure half slave and half free." "No nation," he might equally well have said, "can long endure half honest and half unscrupulous."

In its basic message, Christianity has certain great declarations that

will certainly make the men who believe them trustworthy. If ever there was a time, now is the hour, for the Christian Church to declare the fundamental necessity for righteousness, honesty, and decency. The first thing that was drilled into the Hebrew people was that the affairs of men are the immediate concern of God. Say unto them, the voice said to Moses, "I am"; say that "I am sent you to lead them." And time has yet to show that any civilization or any group of men can live long in the land who do not see life as a vast moral matter with an inflexible moral government, a God behind it, who do not honor human beings, even in the weakness of old age, because they are human. Time has yet to show any civilization which can endure where men steal, either by burglary or by a lobby or by selling worthless securities. Time has yet to show any civilization which has long endured where murder was condoned, and where adultery was treated lightly. The sun has never shone for long on any nation where false witness and dishonest courts existed. The status of any civilization has not long remained upright when the iron of its foundation was mixed with the clay of covetousness and deceit. "Take heed," said Jesus, "and beware of covetousness." It is the deadly poison that breeds wild speculative stock markets followed by suicides, bank failures, men walking the streets with staring, hopeless eyes and little children enfeebled for lack of food.

I fear that religion has been switched off for many a long year from declaring the great, majestic moral facts of human existence. Great bodies of really devout men have been concerned to demonstrate the validity of some creed, some form of church government, some method of baptism or some theory of creation or what not. Meantime the forces of evil have aimed straight at the corner stone of all vital religion. They have denied that there is any unseen God. Nearly every modern philosophical school unites in such a denial. Once more, while Moses is on the heights, the too-easily-led Aarons of our day have let the people worship and feast and dance about the Golden Calf, and history repeats itself, because the moral law is as fixed and sure as physical law, *the people have suffered*.

The remedy for our social ills now, as always, is in grasping the sure belief that God is over all and that He is righteous as well as kind. A subtle moral anæsthesia has of late been spread like a gaseous curtain over the teachings of Jesus. We have spoken of his tenderness, his guilelessness, his forgiveness and our ears have been stopped to his stern declarations of the necessity of righteousness, declarations as unyielding as those of Moses, Amos, or Elijah, and on precisely the same things. "Take heed and beware

of all covetousness." "Strait is the gate and narrow is the way that leadeth unto life." "Without is weeping and gnashing of teeth." "Woe unto you that devour widows' houses." "They are the blind leading the blind, they shall both fall into the ditch." "I tell you that not one stone shall be left standing upon another."

Granting that men must be honest and decent if they are to maintain a decent and enduring civilization, how, one asks, can men be made so? First of all, let us see that honesty, justice, self-control, are the higher, possibly the highest reaches of human development and that they are attained only by volition. It certainly follows then that they can be acquired. Morality is not natural, in the sense that it develops as automatically as animal life develops. It is natural in the sense that learning to read is natural. It is capable of being acquired. National life is not natural, in the sense of being automatic, it is volitional. Men have exactly the kind of government that they choose to have. We chose to have a republic, and if we neglect it and let it fall into the hands of scheming lobbyists, it is because we do not care to make the effort to keep it pure. When the majority of a city's people consider that public office is a public trust, the city officials will consider that office is a trust and not a racket. Morality must be learned, it can be learned, but not unless it is adequately taught. And the business of our religion is, and has been since the days of Abraham, to teach men that they must be decent because this world is made and governed by a God who is wisdom, justice, and kindness, who is holy and the eternal lover of holiness and the unalterable foe of unrighteousness.

I have recently had a curious experience. After preaching for thirty years in a parish pulpit I have suddenly become a layman and been at the receiving end of sermons. It is not entirely a reassuring experience. I have listened to some of the best preachers in America. My first impression is that they are not convincing, my second is that the preaching is in the main effeminate. Intellectually vigorous, delightful in literary finish, but essentially effeminate. I can well understand why vigorous men and women would have no taste for it. It is cerebral, it has become defensive, it has allowed itself to be pushed off its own best battle ground, it lacks the splendor and the majesty that preaching must have if it is to command the attention of that part of the world that needs it most.

It is, I think, a wholesome sign that something more of splendor and majesty is coming back into public worship. No enduring national life can be built on a form of religion that conceives of God as a magnified Rotarian and conducts its worship in what Doctor Johnson used to call the

shirtsleeve fashion. But increased dignity in worship is hopeful only when it points toward increased dignity in conception of God and human responsibility.

In the main, modern religion is lacking in the note of absolute assurance and imperial truth. I mean such an atmosphere as radiates from a man who can talk like this, "What shall we then say to these things? If God is for us who is against us? Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or anguish, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril or sword—nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus." It was in a social time like ours that this same man dared to say, "Be not deceived, God is not mocked, whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap."

Honesty and decency and trustworthiness can be taught, yes, but can be made to grow only in a soil to which they are adapted and in which they can thrive. And, broadly speaking, these virtues grow in men who conceive of life with a sure background of spiritual reality. One must admit that there are agnostics who are splendid and trustworthy men; fine flowers will grow in a favored conservatory or a pot, but crops grow only in the open field.

Our religion rests on the great conception of human life lived in the hollow of God's hand. This is the natural soil in which virtues grow. A firm belief in a good God gives men cheerfulness, sanity, dignity, and makes a center for their lives. It keeps the house from falling when the storm comes. It answers the great questions of every life, Whence came I? Why am I here? Whither do I go?

It gives a soil in which may grow forceful and dependable, progressive men, and women fit to be their mates and mothers. It makes a climate in which homes and schools and universities may develop in suitable health. It gives a meaning to the arts and confers a majesty on government and business.

There is no good fortune that can come to mankind that can compare with the happiness of an assured belief in a good God. Even a second-rate sort of a God is better than none at all. The understanding of God as Elijah knew his Jehovah was defective but it produced an Elijah. The knowledge of God as David had it was defective but it produced the majestic conceptions of the Twenty-third Psalm. The God who was

described by Jesus as Our Father as well as our Creator is beyond all these, elevating and dignifying to men. Faith in such a God cannot fail to breed men and women of majestic proportions, exactly the type of men as leaders that we mourn the lack of to-day.

The straightforward declaration of the God of Jesus is the most wholesome and needful thing needed at this present time. One does not hear it too often. No amount of conscientious reasoning about secondary things can substitute for it.

Furthermore, the preaching of God the Father has already demonstrated its power to make men dignified, decent and dependable. It was thrust into a civilization that was wealthy, cultured, and Godless. Its foremost speaker described the civilization of his day thus: "And even as they refused to have God in their knowledge, God gave them up unto a reprobate mind, to do those things that are not fitting, being filled with all unrighteousness, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness, full of every murder, strife, deceit—disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant breakers, without natural affection, unmerciful." The direct preaching of God in a society like that produced a generation of men so much better that the same man described them thus, "And you did be made alive when you were dead through your trespasses and sins."

The same preaching will do the same thing again. This is the vast resource of the Christian Church. It is not in cultured scholars, eloquent speakers or lofty Gothic arches bathed in the lovely tones of stained glass. It is not in the constantly shifting front of intellectual defense. Our strength and our fortress is in God. Our nation and our civilization is decaying for lack of the salt of truth which is perfectly competent to save it. When men genuinely believe in Jesus' God the Father, the almighty, the forgiving and the inexorably just, they themselves become sons of God, dignified, decent, dependable.



# Philosophy for Ministers

CHARLES A. BAYLIS

THE duties of a minister are axacting, and to perform them successfully he needs not only unusual traits of character but intellectual equipment of a high order. To the attainment of the latter the study of philosophy can make a significant contribution. Many problems that confront a minister are philosophical in nature, and professional philosophical training can give him much assistance as he seeks their solution. On many other problems philosophical knowledge will often throw new light and fresh insight. And further, the training involved in the study of philosophy tends to develop mental traits which should be of much value to religious as to other leaders.

One of the important tasks confronting a minister to-day is to discern in the midst of our modern chaos underlying elements of order and value. He is expected, on the basis of a broad understanding of changing facts and eternal values, to interpret present trends *sub specie æternitatis* and distinguish in the rapid flux of events the real and lasting values from the merely apparent and transitory ones. In this undertaking his most urgent need, perhaps, is wisdom, that is, a proper apprehension of the variety, relative importance, and interconnection of the values that enter into human life. Wisdom in this sense is precisely what the study of philosophy is supposed to yield. Literally, philosophy is the love of wisdom, and one of its special fields, ethics, is especially concerned with the systematic study of questions of value.

The importance of careful study of such questions is perhaps greater to-day than ever before. With rapid advances in the natural and social sciences, more and more power is being put into man's hands to do with as he wills. This power gives him in ever increasing measure the ability to attain anything he desires, but the sciences which give him such power help him not at all in determining what is worth desiring. A knowledge of chemistry, for example, can be used either to preserve life or to destroy it. But what is worth preserving and what ought to be destroyed are ethical questions, and a systematic attempt to answer them is a philosophical undertaking.

A proper evaluation of the passing scene depends indeed on the previous determination of the correct answer to one of the most fundamental questions of ethics, namely, What is intrinsically good? What is immediately valuable in its own right? For all the things which are instru-

mentally valuable are so only because they lead to something which is valuable not for anything further but for itself. To determine accurately this ultimate end at a time when men, richer in power than ever before, are rushing at accelerating speed they know not where, is an especially important task. Only by comparison with this standard of intrinsic value can contemporary civilization be justly evaluated and the many conflicting endeavors at which men so furiously labor properly appraised as worthy or worthless.

Questions in the field of social ethics are also of considerable importance to-day. Here what is involved is the proper application of ethical principles to social problems arising in government, international relations, economic activity, education, and family life. Such problems lie on the borderland between ethics and social science and require for their proper treatment a knowledge of both. Hence, hesitant to go beyond their own field, philosophers and social scientists have both shunned them. Yet these social problems of modern life are becoming more and more pressing, and they demand immediate attention if disaster is to be avoided. Fortunately some of the world's leaders, including some of its ministers, are now attacking the intricate difficulties involved in their solution. To succeed they must combine that knowledge of the social sciences which makes possible the attainment of desired social ends with philosophical knowledge of the ends which are worth desiring. Wisdom here, as elsewhere, is essential.

This wisdom, the ability properly to compare values, can be and is attained to some extent by almost everyone. In the ordinary course of life an individual learns much, and as he grows older the wisdom of age enables him to evaluate many things more justly than was possible for him in his youth. In this sense everyone frames for himself a philosophy of life. But experience is an unsystematic teacher as well as a hard one, and he who learns only thus will probably have a philosophy that is fragmentary and full of inconsistencies. Ethics is the science of value *par excellence* and he who would increase the accuracy of his judgments of value should not neglect its aid.

It is true that our search for values is aided by the ethical precepts revealed through the world's great religions. These ethical doctrines, revealed in direct inspiration or sacred writings, are usually, however, insufficient to constitute a complete ethical system. They tend to be fragmentary, scattered, and unorganized. To make them into a consistent and complete system requires much labor and ingenuity, and a thorough ethical training.

Even the teachings of Jesus require interpretation, extension, generalization, and specific application before they indicate solutions to modern ethical disputes. Taken literally they do not mention, and ought not to be expected to mention, such contemporary problems as high tariffs, war debts, unemployment insurance, and the like. To make the great teachings which have come down to us applicable to to-day's problems and vital in to-day's life is one of the important functions of religious teachers and religious journals. For its fulfillment a training in ethics is invaluable.

Moreover, the rationalistic temper of the present age demands a reasoned explanation of the moral precepts offered for its acceptance. Authoritative endorsement of any dictum is not accepted as sufficient guarantee of its worth. When, to-day, a curious youth asks, "How does anyone know that the world is round?" he is not long satisfied by the answer, "The teacher says so," or "The textbook says so," or even by "Science says so." Similarly, the assurance that such and such is good, or bad, because "The Bible says so," or because "Religion says so," no longer brings complete satisfaction. For, even aside from the fact that enthusiasts for a cause find it all too easy to believe and to assert that God is on their side, the goodness or badness of things is the ground, not the consequence, of divine approval or disapproval. Murder, for instance, is bad, not because God forbids it, but he forbids it because it is bad. Its badness is due to its own nature and is capable of rational explanation without reliance on revealed truth. Such explanation is being increasingly demanded, and any attempt to furnish it is itself an essay in ethics.

Ethics, however, is not the only branch of philosophy whose problems overlap those of the minister. The question suggested above of the merits of the method of faith and revelation as compared with the merits of the method of scientific investigation is one which often confronts the religious thinker, and it is a central problem of that branch of philosophy known as epistemology, or the theory of knowledge. The place of faith in the life of a rational man is essentially a philosophical question, but it is one which the minister is often called upon to answer.

Again, the liberal and intelligent minister should have a clear understanding of the nature of science and its place in modern life. This requires far more than knowledge of the fruits of scientific inquiry in any field. It requires a critical understanding of the assumptions on which the science in question rests and the methods by which its findings have been reached. For a doubt with regard to these assumptions and methods makes dubious the results which they yield.

Further, scientific knowledge does not carry with it a realization of its own significance. For example, what changes, if any, in our philosophic outlook are demanded by Einsteinian relativity? by quantum mechanics? Does the new physics mean that sheer chance underlies the apparent order of macroscopic phenomena? Or does it signify, as some physicists have urged, that "God's in his heaven—All's right with the world"? Or is it capable of quite different interpretations? These are metaphysical, philosophical questions, and science itself offers no answer to them. That such is the case is made pretty evident by the writings of celebrated scientists, who, unversed in philosophy, all too frequently conclude excellent accounts of scientific achievements with miserably poor philosophic evaluations of their human significance.

A proper understanding of the place of science in the world and of the significance of scientific achievement requires a thorough criticism of the basic assumptions and methods of the sciences and an interpretation and evaluation of their results in terms of human life. These two tasks are precisely the subject matter of the philosophy of science, and whoever essays them, be he a scientist or a minister, becomes in this very undertaking a philosopher and he will do well to seek expert training.

The history of philosophy also offers much knowledge of value to the minister. It is an intrinsic part of the history of man. Knowledge of the thoughts of Plato, Aristotle, or Kant is at least as important as knowledge of the deeds of Alexander, the Cæsars, or Frederick the Great. Moreover, the thoughts of the great philosophers have often profoundly influenced the history of man. For example, Plato and the Platonic Academy deeply affected Greek and Roman legal and political institutions. Hobbes and Locke were sources of inspiration for the framers of the Declaration of Independence. And occasionally philosophers have themselves become rulers. Marcus Aurelius in ancient times and President Masaryk of Czechoslovakia to-day are examples.

A study of Christian doctrines which neglected their springs in Greek philosophy would be wholly inadequate. Much of the New Testament cannot be properly understood without the background of a knowledge of Greek philosophy. Again, such a knowledge is indispensable to a correct interpretation of the writings of the early church fathers, and of the great Scholastics. And, of course, for those interested in theology, a knowledge of the *Weltanschauungen* of the world's outstanding philosophers is invaluable.

Metaphysics and the philosophy of religion are other philosophic fields

which the religious thinker traverses. Theology indeed differs from metaphysics only in the fact that it seeks its first premises through revelation, whereas the latter takes as its base only that which scientific and philosophic inquiry finds. Natural theology, eschewing revelation, is a branch of metaphysics.

Finally, questions as to the nature and value of religion are not themselves religious questions but philosophical ones, and form a part of the subject matter of the philosophy of religion. In so far as a scientist understands the assumptions on which his work rests and its rôle and value in human life he is a philosopher of science, and, similarly, in so far as a teacher in the field of religion understands the significance of his work, he has attained insight into the philosophy of religion.

In short, a minister to a large extent is a philosopher also. The only question is whether he is to be a good or a bad philosopher. His chance of being the former increases in proportion as he provides himself with professional training in philosophy.

Philosophical study, however, offers the minister more than relevant knowledge; it offers him an intellectual training of high caliber. Ministers as well as other leaders should have minds so trained that they can judge controversial and emotional issues solely on their objective merits without passion or prejudice. In these days of powerful propaganda, of catchwords and slogans, of high-pressure advertising and emotional clap-trap, a mind that is neither easily credulous nor overly skeptical, that neither accepts blindly nor sneers complacently, but that investigates first and then decides on the basis of the evidence, is rare indeed, yet it is precisely the type of mind that is needed, and that philosophical study tends to develop.

There are many elements in the study of philosophy which make for the formation and retention of such desirable mental traits. The very scope of philosophic inquiry tends to develop a broad outlook, a philosophical perspective. Students of philosophy learn to see problems as a whole and in their proper settings, and to detect one-sided views and exaggerated contentions. All scientific study yields practice in passing judgment non-emotionally on the basis of the evidence alone, but in philosophy this practice is given with regard to the very questions that are ordinarily so fraught with emotion that rational discussion of them is for most people impossible. Problems in the philosophy of religion and ethics touch topics heavily overlaid with feeling, topics on which many people will brook no opinion whatever contrary to their own. Philosophical study involves the objective consideration of even the most passionate prejudices on even the



most fundamentally important matters. It requires clear exhibition and critical consideration of the most radically diverse opinions concerning them. More than one student has been surprised to learn that there are other opinions on vital subjects than those he has unthinkingly cherished, and has been shocked to discover that these unorthodox and to him wicked views can be impartially discussed without the use of opprobrious epithets. "How can you discuss such things without getting angry?" the beginner sometimes asks. This practice in probing highly charged problems on the basis of their objective merits tends to give students a calmness and objectivity of judgment that is of great value.

Further, prolonged philosophic work under proper guidance is sure to bring to the student's clear consciousness certain logical distinctions that are essential to correct judgment. Such, for example, is the difference between the psychological causes and the logical reasons underlying an opinion, the first being merely the events that led to its being held, and the second being the grounds on which it is tenable, the evidence of its truth. Another is the distinction between knowledge, that is, belief based on evidence, and opinion, that is, belief without evidence. And with regard to the evidence itself, the difference between objectively verifiable facts and subjective wishes or desires can not fail to be remarked by the able student. Insistence on the observance of these distinctions in their own philosophic work tends to habituate the minds of students to the recognition of relevant evidence and to the passing of judgment on the basis of it alone. Beyond this, training in logic gives students facility in detecting fallacies in reasoning and ability to make and adhere to the subtle distinctions of meaning without which confusion in thought can not be avoided.

Philosophic training thus tends to develop calm and open minds, intellectually honest and critically alert, able and accustomed to reason sharply and logically, to develop trains of abstract thought systematically, and to evaluate proposals on their merits. Moreover, such practice in discussing rationally the *pros* and *cons* of controversial questions brings a student to a more tolerant understanding of views other than his own, stimulates his thought, arouses his imagination, enriches his intellectual resources, and deepens and broadens his philosophy. Finally, if there is any such thing as intellectual training in general, the study of philosophy offers an opportunity for development equal to that of any other study, for some of its problems are as intricate, subtle, and difficult as any to be found anywhere.

Other studies will each develop one or more of these desirable traits; philosophy tends to develop them all. It does this at the same time that

it imparts knowledge of ethics, of logic, of the theory of knowledge, of metaphysics, of the philosophy of religion, and of the philosophy of science, all of them of importance to religious thinkers. That it is of outstanding value for ministers can hardly be denied.

One source of doubt as to the wisdom of philosophical study on the part of those preparing for religious work is due to an additional value of such study that has not yet been mentioned. Those remarked above are its instrumental values, that is, what it is good for. But it is also enjoyable in its own right. To all who take delight in the pursuit of wisdom the study of philosophy is a source of immediate satisfaction. And because it is thus intrinsically enjoyable some who begin it as a preparation for a religious career become attached to philosophy and forsake their first love for their second. The writer is particularly aware of the possibility of such an occurrence for it is precisely what happened to him, and further, he has had occasion to observe similar changes overtaking some of the most brilliant candidates for the ministry that he has known.

In some ways it is a sad thing to see brilliant men destined for the ministry thus turn to other fields, for the ministry, like other professions, is in deep need of able men. It may well be contended, however, that those who are thus lured away are probably at bottom most interested in something other than the ministry itself. Very often their primary interest is in ideas, and this has led them to belief in an ideal of social betterment and a desire to aid in transforming the world into their vision of the kingdom of God on earth. Being most acutely conscious of this ideal and of their wish to help in its realization they naturally enough make plans to enter the ministry. As a preparation they study philosophy and find that it attracts them mightily. About the same time, if, as so often is the case, they spend their Sundays in church work or are in charge of small chapels or churches, they slowly realize that the pastoral side of a minister's work does not appeal to them. Gradually comes a realization that their primary interest is in ideas and ideals, and that their enthusiasm for the welfare of mankind is concerned much more with man in the mass than with individual men. What really delights them is intellectual activity, the handling of abstract concepts, and the framing of ideals of a better day. It seems clear that such persons are far better philosophers than they would be ministers. They are not really a loss to the ministry for they would never have been happy nor done their best work there. On the other hand, those who are really fitted for the ministry will not be tempted away by philosophy's wiles. A good minister, in addition to having most of the qualities of an

ideal philosopher, should have certain other traits as well. He needs, for example, not only a desire to work for people but a real love of working with them. Candidates for the ministry who are imbued with such a spirit will not be lured into philosophy. Those very qualities which will make them good ministers will keep the ministry more attractive to them than philosophy could ever be.

Another and still less well-founded source of doubt as to the wisdom of philosophical study is aptly expressed by the fear of the timid college freshman who naively asked his adviser, "Which is it, philosophy or psychology, that destroys one's faith?" Such a fear springs from faintness of heart and a lack of faith in the faith which one believes to be in danger. For philosophy seeks the truth where religious matters are concerned as in all else. It seeks it by painstaking inquiry and investigation, and in the long run it can do naught but make religious truths like all others shine the more brightly by further corroboration. It is only he who feels his faith doubtful who can justify opposition to full and impartial investigation. To be sure, a little philosophy may be a dangerous thing. Partial knowledge here as elsewhere promotes a sophomoric cynicism. But further philosophic study can not fail to make it apparent that an easy skepticism is as short-sighted and mistaken as an easy credulity, and a thorough probing of philosophic depths can not but verify the truths already revealed by religion.

In what has been said of the importance of philosophy for ministers there has been no intention to minimize the value of other subjects. A wide knowledge of the natural and social sciences is most desirable, and special training in psychology should not be neglected. But the study of philosophy enriches these other studies, makes possible a critical understanding of their methods and a realization of the significance of their results. It enables its students to frame a view of the universe as a whole and see these other studies in their proper relations.

Of course, the value of philosophical study will vary depending on the extent and manner in which it is undertaken. To be productive of the best results it requires capable guidance. The mere reading of philosophical literature, unless this has been preceded by systematic training, will not often yield satisfactory results. Most philosophy is difficult reading for the uninitiated; it is filled with technical terminology; and unless one knows what to look for its significance may be missed. Again, some of the principal values of the study of philosophy come from critical discussion, and these require for their realization contact with trained philosophic minds.

In America the place to study philosophy is a college or university equipped with a first-rate department of philosophy. Practicing ministers who desire to devote some of their time to philosophical study will find it well worth their while to participate as a special or extension student in the organized philosophical work of some university. Students preparing for the ministry should be urged to make philosophy their concentration or major subject during their college course. This is in accordance with the advice of some of the leading theological seminaries, which urge their prospective students to devote their college years to obtaining as liberal an education as possible, reserving specialization in religious subjects for the theological school.

To obtain the greatest value from the study of philosophy care should be taken in choosing the men under whom one plans to work. For departments of philosophy, it has been said, are very much like the famous little girl with a curl down the middle of her forehead. When they are good, they are very, very good, but when they are bad, they are horrid.

In choosing a university in which to study philosophy a number of *desiderata* should be kept in mind. It is desirable that the department should consist of several members. Much of the value of philosophical study comes from the clash of conflicting views and the discussion to which this clash gives rise. This value is largely lost by exclusive study under one man, even though he be exceptionally fine. For the same reason it is better not to study in a department all of whose members are adherents of one particular school of philosophy. What is most desirable is the influence of a number of well-trained philosophers, all of fine mental endowments and high intellectual ideals and standards, but with points of view and special interests as diverse as possible. It is important that these men, in addition to being good teachers, should be actively producing scholars, so that by their own intellectual growth they may inspire their students to similar progress. For this reason, also, a department with at least a small group of graduate students professionally interested in philosophy offers more intellectual stimulation than a department devoted exclusively to undergraduate instruction. On the other hand there should not be so many students that practically all work has to be conducted in large lecture courses. A large amount of individual work under the direct supervision of members of the staff is of much more value. Finally, the department chosen should not be one which devotes itself exclusively to the study of the history of philosophy. Much more stimulating is a department that, well equipped with historical knowledge, proceeds to investigate phil-

osophical problems on their merits, and attempts to make the history that others later may study.

It will be noticed that orthodoxy of religious opinions has not been mentioned as a desirable quality for those who teach philosophy to religious minds. It is obvious that unanimity of opinion, whether orthodox or heterodox, makes impossible some of the most important values of philosophical study. Further, orthodoxy tends to defeat the very end for which it is sometimes urged, the safeguarding of the faith of the students. He whose faith has never been exposed to questioning is apt to fall an easy victim of his first critic. Far better is the faith that has been tested in the fire of the severest criticism and has survived tempered and true.

Such an ideal department as that described is not always available but the closer it is approximated the better is the opportunity for the capable student to reap the full advantages of philosophical study. And even under circumstances far less favorable the earnest study of philosophy can yield rich benefits. It is to be hoped that to an increasing extent these will be garnered by ministers, for the ministry, though rich in rewards, is an arduous and exacting calling, and it demands of those who follow it the fullest development and the utmost exertion of their powers.



## The Liberal Shibboleth

GILBERT H. BARNES

**R**ECENTLY a clergyman of liberal persuasion told me with some chagrin that his colleagues had read him out of the liberal ranks.

At a summer conference of ministers and laymen on social problems he had taken a position as to capitalism and the profit motive which no economist would have called conservative, but which the conference termed hidebound reaction. He remarked, however: "I am not disturbed by the names they called me, but I am disturbed by the attitude on the part of so many leading delegates that a liberal must be either a socialist or headed in that direction."

Whether or not the trend toward socialism is as strong as my friend supposed, there does appear to be an increasing tendency among groups of liberal ministers to identify protests against economic evils with pronouncements against capitalism itself. To a bystander, however, these clerical pronouncements seem in some degree to miss the mark. Most of them center their attack upon the profit motive as the driving force of business; but the profit motive is not the central characteristic of capital. No system can be described simply in terms of the motives or the intentions of the participants. The capitalist intends to make a profit, it is true; but what are the conditions which enable him to do so? It is these conditions, and not his motives, which make up the capitalistic system. Nor can the system be described as an order of free and unlimited competition, or as a system of individual enterprise. It is not, and it is becoming less so every day. Combinations and consolidations, agreements and treaties, proceed even as this is written; and to-morrow competition will be less intense, individualism will be less pervasive, than they are to-day.

Neither can the capitalistic system be described as one of production owned and controlled by the capitalist. As a matter of fact the ownership function is not by any means uniform throughout the business structure. In a legal sense the capitalist is always the absolute owner of production; but ownership itself is a variable term in practice, implying different functions at different times. In a simpler economic community than ours, ownership customarily connotes use and control of property as well as a claim upon its income. But in our community the development of the corporation has from the first divorced use from ownership, and more recent changes have separated ownership even from control. At present

a large majority of stockholders in America are so situated that it is impossible for them to exercise any control whatsoever over their property. To these dispossessed capitalists remains one function only: a claim upon the earnings of the businesses they own. This claim is by no means a mandatory one. More often than not, their claims on net earnings are subordinated to a plan for the maintenance and conduct of the enterprise which has been formulated by those in control rather than by the stockholders themselves. In many cases the claims of the owners on earnings are allowed only to the extent deemed necessary to prevent their making trouble; and the remainder is either returned to the business or is diverted in some indirect manner to enrich whatever individuals are actually in control. Although this state of affairs is indubitably capitalism, it is not ownership and control of business by capitalists.

Other characteristics of present-day business commonly identified with capitalism are more clearly incidental. Roundabout methods of production and machine technique are no more traits of capitalism than of communism or socialism; while the division of economic society into different classes—a characteristic of all industrial communities—is a product of the specialization necessary to large-scale production, and not a trait of capitalism.

The essence of capitalism lies first, in the subordination of production to consumers' demand, as it is expressed through an organically related system of market prices; and second, in a willingness on the part of those in control of production to venture productive property in the expectation that if their venture satisfies consumers' demand, they will make a profit. The essential core of capitalism is the free market, and the subordination to that market of the entire productive mechanism. It is an international market and through it every kind and species of product and service is brought into competitive and complementary relation with every other kind of product and service. This and this alone is capitalism.

It is clear that, contrary to general belief, capitalism includes consumption as well as production. The popular misconception of capitalism as merely a system of production is consistent; for never in history has there been a preoccupation with production comparable to our own. Every age, it is true, apotheosizes some institution. Four hundred years ago it was the kingdom as against the feudal nobles. A hundred years later it was the church; and for generations hosts of the faithful poured out their blood for some creed or other. In the eighteenth century it was the free democracy against the hereditary ruler; and eight decades later the South

of our land fought for the divine right of the community as against federal control.

The religion of this age is production, and its worship taints the faith of us all. Why must we have high tariffs? It is not for the benefit of the common man: high tariffs operate always to his injury. We must have them for the sake of business. Why must we patronize home industries? Are their goods better or cheaper? No, they are often worse and dearer. We must buy at home in order to make prosperity for business. What has been the argument advanced against every measure of economic welfare—workman's compensation, better housing, child-labor legislation, a minimum wage for women, a pure food and drug act, blue sky laws and the lengthy list of humanitarian and legal reforms so desperately needed in this day? They are bad for business. And what, pray, is business to be good for? Is it the consumer? By no means. Keep the consumer in ignorance. Never let him know the truth about your products. Fool him with false and misleading advertisements, cajole him, threaten him, break down his sales resistance! Load him up, and mortgage his future! Finally, when he can buy no more, accuse him of subversive agitation, charge him with striking on his job—a buyer's strike! At best the consumer in our economy is a convenience for production; at worst the consumer is considered production's enemy.

Despite its oppression of the consumer, however, our present capitalism, like every other economy, is based on service. It exists for the consumer's good alone, and for no other cause under heaven. Its purpose is to make things for people to use. These things we think of as means to personal satisfaction, but such is not their primary function. In practice we clothe and feed our families, pay our pledge to the church, contribute to education either in the form of taxes or by the payment of tuition, provide the necessary repairs for our homes, and spend money for a thousand other things which have no essential reference to personal satisfactions. Indeed we seldom buy for the sake of the things themselves, but rather for the sake of the family, the church, the community, whose needs they serve. They make up the warp and woof, the living texture of social life. It is true that some of these goods are bad and others are foolish. It is also true that in many cases the power to buy goods is distributed in a manner which violates every standard of reason and justice. But whether the goods we buy are wise or foolish, good or bad, too many or too few, their multiform variety makes up the manner, the very substance of our lives.

To supply these goods, these means to living ends, our business order exists. It has no ends in itself; its values are all secondary, all derived. It exists for service. It lives for us, not we for it; and as it serves, it survives. When business turns about and subordinates us as consumers to production, the servant becomes master, and the world goes mad. Nor will sanity return until man and his welfare again are made the end of life, and business serves that end alone.

In order to make clear this consumption aspect of capitalism, let us contrast it with its opposite, communism. The nature of communism—and of socialism too—requires the elimination of the free world market. Communism is a form of planned economy; it begins with a deliberate, centralized national plan, which determines what shall be produced, and how much; for what is produced must be consumed. In a communist state, therefore, there cannot be a free market. Production is determined by authority, and consumption is determined by production.

Doubtless one of the reasons for the world's concern with the Russian experiment in communism lies in its deification of production. It is this which has set radical proletarians wild with hope, and capitalists cold with apprehension; for to capitalists and proletarians alike in this age, production is their religion. And now that Russia has given it a creed, a heaven and even a God, how can the proletarians of the world do aught but believe and worship? And how can the capitalists, like the demons in hell, but believe and tremble?

It is not the Russian plan that causes apprehension. In America capitalists themselves are playing with the idea of planned production. And it is not the elimination of the free consumer that alarms them; for any successful plan for production involves control of consumption. It is not, therefore, the communism itself which the capitalists fear, because the essence of communism is planned production for controlled consumption. What is wrong is that the plan does not operate for the benefit of the capitalist. The flaw in the plan is that it leaves his kind out. And the danger of the plan, as the capitalist sees it, is not that without him it may fail, but that without him it may succeed. Indeed, how can it fail? It has a schedule ably drawn under the eyes of the best capitalistic engineers; it has machinery designed by the best of the capitalists' own technicians. Above all, it has eliminated capitalism's great unknown, consumer's choice. It has enshrined production and made it God. And if it does succeed without the capitalist, what then? Said one of them: "The very existence of a prosperous and successful Russia would be a menace to the world." God

forgive the man whose self-interest prompts him to view the well being of millions of his fellow creatures in such a light!

Contrary to capitalist fears, the threat of communism to capitalism is largely imaginary. Like most radical philosophies, communism supports a national policy rather than a world revolution. Indeed, if we look beyond the theory of communism, with its acrid Marxian logic, and view the realities of the Russian situation, we find a condition to which communistic control is admirably adapted. When the system of inherited privilege which made up the old Russian regime was swept away, there remained a vast undeveloped empire, with 160 million backward, semi-barbaric people, docile and easily controlled by virtue of centuries of absolutism. Touching its borders to the west was a modern industrialism, self-made and self-ruling, with a technique so highly standardized that it could be applied elsewhere from above. And in absolute control was one of the most brilliant, far-seeing statesmen of his time. What an opportunity! Lenin resolved to employ the technique developed by capitalism itself to raise in one generation his barbaric empire from its low level to the level of western Europe. In order to do this, he established martial law—a war regime such as we tasted fifteen years ago—under the name of communism.

We all know that the cost of his program in terms of human values is as much as man can bear. In a social sense, life has largely stopped in Russia until the lift shall have been completed. Rather than consumers, the people are only units in a mass, regimented items in the five year plan.

But when the experiment succeeds and the goal is achieved, life must again go on. Then as before there will be growth, which means differentiation in a thousand unpredictable ways. Of necessity the world market will once more filter in. Once more—but now how different from the old regime—the multiform complexity of world ways will enrich the ways of Russian communities toward differentiation and synthesis. And once more values will be published and compared in a wider and freer exchange; until—possibly without shock or violence—Russia will drift back into the world market. Communism will have evolved into capitalism.

Meanwhile, however, the philosophy of communism serves as a religious basis for social control until the war against economic barbarism is won. In this aspect the function of communism in Russia differs little from that of philosophies, both political and economic, throughout history. Its function is to justify a useful policy and to rationalize the coercion necessary to make that policy successful.

The fear which communism inspires throughout capitalism arises



from the fact that capitalists themselves think in similar terms. Like communists they envisage production as the dominant institution of social life. Like communists too they view the business structure as a mechanism to be exploited by those in control. If business were what they thought, there would be reason for their fears; but the business man's economy, national in extent and predatory in purpose, with interests not only not subordinated to humanity but at times even hostile to it, is an economy which exists nowhere on land or sea. Fortunately, the economic structure being what it is, capitalistic fear of communism is gratuitous.

Jacob Viner once remarked that the task of economists is "the defense of capitalism against the capitalists." It would be more just to say that capitalism needs defense against the spirit of the age. Capitalists are not a race of men apart; they embody the traditions, the prejudices, and the limitations of their community. Thus although capitalism's inveterate tendency is toward internationality, capitalists think and act, like their fellow citizens, in the spirit of the nationalist tradition. Though the effect of capitalism is to make business increasingly a matter of public concern, in the frontier spirit capitalists still demand "less government in business." The outgrown traditions of class and privilege, of inviolable property right, of imperialism and war, capitalists continue to apply to the economy of capitalism, with results often harmful and disastrous.

The conflict here is plainly between tradition and growth rather than between capitalism and the capitalists, and its solution is not revolution but enlightenment. The process of enlightenment must be one of moral education in which every instrument of social leadership should participate. Here the church can make a valuable contribution.

The work of enlightenment will not be peaceful. In part it will proceed by direct attacks upon the privileges, protections and immunities by which certain interests exploit labor and the public. It will conflict with traditions widely accepted; and it will be opposed at every stage by those unscrupulous individuals who are always ready to profit by confusion.

Toward the bringing of enlightenment, liberals in the church have already made a noble effort. It would be unfortunate if they should now divide upon their ultimate objectives. If the tendency to identify liberal protest with the case against capitalism should continue, its effect might be to alienate those liberals whose concern is with economic evils rather than with economic structure. The final result of their alienation might well be to divert one of the most powerful of social instruments from effective measures for economic betterment.

# The Church and the Cause of Christ

EDWARD A. STEINER

FROM the vantage ground of an active ministry, and then of a teacher of religion in a Christian college, I have watched the growth of the Protestant Church, and the decay of its power. I came into the ministry as a convert—with conviction, zeal, a passion for the new faith and my inborn love of humanity strengthened and clarified. While I saw no heavenly gates opened, I saw a door affording escape from a narrow racialism into the unhampered contact with all men, and a fuller revelation of the love of God through the life, teachings, and death of Christ.

I found in Christianity the fulfilment of all my longings for a richer, broader and more encompassing life, and I can honestly say that I became "a prisoner of Jesus Christ," not just a member of a church, and that I entered the ministry not because it offered a career, but because it offered me a cause worth living for and dying for.

I now think it a mistake for a convert to enter the ministry; for I soon discovered that I was a prisoner, not of Jesus Christ, but of an institution which bore his name, and which in my first pastorate was associated with more than twenty similar institutions which did not enlarge the borders of the kingdom of God, but narrowed it.

In my parish, Protestantism, as a protest against ritualism, so closely akin to idolatry, and against the sacrilegious sale of holy wares, was a spent force. Ample prejudice existed against Catholicism, some of it in organized form, like the Junior Order of American Mechanics, and the A. P. A., but it was fighting ghosts, it appealed to no lofty, Christian ideal; only to the lower, if not the lowest impulses of the human heart: prejudice against the unlike.

Having escaped a similar bondage, and knowing how prejudice disintegrates rather than integrates the human family, I would have none of it, and gave myself in my preaching and teaching to the elimination rather than to the fostering of unchristian hatreds. I have lived long enough to see a return to Rome, if not in spirit, yet in more or less feeble imitation, though the prejudices against Catholics have been but slightly mitigated.

Denominationalism had ceased to be a profound cause. Baptist ministers still caught fire over more water. The older Presbyterian ministers still argued enthusiastically about infant damnation. Methodists still "came forward" only to slide backward, and I as a Congregationalist urged people to join my church to prove their independence. Independence in a country

where everybody is independent was not a cause to live or die for—it was more or less an escape from responsibility. As ministers we all tried to attract members because our church was more or less sociable, or because we could turn more spectacular somersaults in the pulpit.

Denominationalism was not yet dead, but it was slowly dying; it had ceased to be a cause except in the unholy mountains in the South, where feuds lend color to an otherwise drab existence, and in California, where it is now an asset, and shares with the climate and the movies as an attraction to visitors.

Foreign missions was a cause which the church still sponsored by periodical collections, and by feeling some distinction if her sons or daughters gave themselves to carrying the gospel to the heathen. Returned missionaries were still received as heroes, and their sermons, descriptive of life among the heathen, were listened to in rapt attention, giving the congregation a "holier than thou" feeling. Distance lent enchantment to Africans in the jungle, but not to the Negroes at home, or to the Chinese in China, the Japanese in Japan and the Hindu in India, all of whom became a menace when they approached the gates of "God's country."

The love of souls was not even "skin deep," certainly not a spiritual force, and while the missionaries advanced at the front, the church retreated into a worse racial isolation than that which I had escaped.

In later years, as a teacher, I have seen the Student Volunteer Movement on our college campus gradually dwindle, while with the coming of the World War, it ceased and has not been revived. Thoughtful young men and women in college believe now that we have no message, no right to preach for "the lesser breed without the law," when the church at home during the war broke nine of the ten commandments, and declared a moratorium on the Sermon on the Mount.

"How dare we go out to preach about the love of God, when our ministers at home preached hate through the long war years, and approved a war, the most deadly and costly in history?"

Foreign Missions as a cause is not yet dead; it is a power, though a waning one, in pleading for a collection; but it has ceased to be the cause which once gave radiance to the church, and inspired her sons and daughters to join themselves to it. Other reasons can be named for the decline of enthusiasm for Foreign Missions, but the chief reason is that it has ceased to be *a cause*.

Temperance was a cause, fanned to a flame by John B. Gough and Frances E. Willard. At that time, saving a man from drunkenness and his

family from want were still worth preaching about; but when the Eighteenth Amendment was incorporated into the Constitution it too ceased to be a cause and became a dogma. A cause is something to stand up for; a dogma is something to sit down on. The church people forgot that though the Constitution of the United States may be infallible, human nature is not!

Revivalism was a cause, though a waning one, when I began my ministry. It had reached its height under Dwight L. Moody, whose human sympathies were never warped by his orthodoxy, and who never used his gifts to enrich himself. It reached its depth under Billy Sunday, when counting souls and cash seemed of equal importance. Saving souls by the machinery of revivalism is now even deader than denominationalism, and the sermons on that subject by the local minister have grown mouldy in his barrel.

The social gospel was a cause to which some ministers gave themselves with genuine enthusiasm, but its plea was refuted by a thinly spread prosperity—the development of labor-saving devices, the blessing of an automobile in every worker's family, and the sale of radios and washing machines on the installment plan. The social message was declared fantastic, and the messengers fanatics. They were damned by being called socialists, disrupters of an organized prosperity and, worst of all, pessimists. Of course they were pessimists, for when everybody sang, "There's a rainbow round my shoulder," they knew that the rains had not yet passed, and the floods had not yet abated.

When American Christians would not go to sleep till they heard the voices of their major prophets, Amos and Andy, they *could* not go to sleep because they heard the voices of Amos and Isaiah crying, "Woe unto them that are at ease in Zion." They were pessimists because they did not rejoice, and were not glad, declaring Mr. Ford the Messiah because he created a new model, and undersold all his competitors. They saw that going speedily was dangerous, especially when people had lost their sense of direction.

Perhaps the social gospel failed because there was not enough gospel in it, because it did not declare emphatically enough, if at all, that nothing was of importance, neither machines nor money nor skyscrapers nor Gothic churches, not even the social gospel, if it did not change men from brute to child of God, from enemy to brother.

The social gospel ceased to be a cause, and the social gospellers saw another cause looming on the horizon: Fundamentalism and Modernism.

Ministers felt themselves "prisoners of Jesus Christ," but perhaps not so often of his compelling, radiant, forgiving and life-giving personality, as of Jesus Christ, a theological phrase. The Fundamentalists had a cause, though they fought not the devil and his chief emissaries, Mammon and Mars; they usually approved them or compromised with them; they fought Darwin and Fosdick. They saw the *Alpha* and the *Omega*, the beginning and end of all evil in the teaching of evolution.

Modernism was a cause, and ministers became prisoners, though rarely of Jesus Christ, but of the last book on evolution, and later of psychology. They became more dogmatic about evolution than the scientists, and they accepted psychology as an exact science, when it was as speculative as theology, and had created as many sects.

They did not fight the Fundamentalists; they ridiculed them. Modernists were the victims of the superiority complex, which was a false front to hide the uncertainty of their cause.

A little too late the saner Fundamentalists and more profound among the Modernists discovered that they had no cause, or that their sermons ceased to attract congregations; and without their being aware of it, the people ceased to be interested in origins, even in destinies; only in parking spaces; not whether Jesus Christ was born of a virgin, and is the third person of the Trinity. God, Christ, and the church had receded from their vision, nor did they function in their world.

Church attendance dwindled. In my own community, in a church which seats some thousand people, and has a membership of eight hundred, two hundred and fifty are a record crowd, except of course on Easter and Christmas when there are theatricals, or when a celebrated preacher is announced to occupy the pulpit.

As a teacher I have to create a hunger for religion in my students. Though they are with but few exceptions children of the church, they are spiritually illiterate. The church has no appeal for them because it has no cause, certainly no cause great enough to kindle enthusiasm, and to result in commitment.

The church, flitting from one cause to another (not neglecting religious education), is expiring, just as did infantile golf, though not so quickly.

If my picture seems drawn too darkly, let me assure my readers that I am not now a pessimist, but a realistic optimist. Now that the "American Babylons are busted," now that the whole world suffers, having been deceived by the sorceries of the kings and captains of industry, I am an optimist because the church has again presented to it a cause.



The world is in confusion and turmoil as in the time of Paul. The old order is passing away, a new world is gestating in the womb of time. It may be born to-morrow. It will come first with judgment, and the church will be the first institution to pass through the cleansing fire. Unless vitality is extensively renewed in the near future nothing may be left of it but a small number of the faithful who have joined themselves to Jesus Christ, whose faith could not be shaken by persecution and distress.

They will be, largely, poor people, and not of the contented middle class. The church will have small means left with which to maintain herself, and the widow's mite will again become more significant than the dollars of those who gave of their superabundance. The church will suffer with all other sufferers in and out of the church. In the tumult and confusion her walls will become the holy Temple and all will find shelter there, no matter what their color or creed.

The church may lose what standing she has in the community, but she will have a cause to stand on, and it will be better for her to perish for a cause than to decay gradually as she is doing to-day.

She will again be a witness to the redeeming power of Christ, not a witness to the damning power of wealth. As the early church triumphed over principalities and powers, so she will triumph over nationalism, capitalism, Bolshevism, and Fascism.

To the end, if it be the end, Christ must live and reign in the church and motivate the conduct of her children. If the church fails now, if there is no saving remnant in her, if there is no vision, no clarified purpose, if she does not espouse the cause of Christ and humanity, she will perish, as she ought.

The most tragic verse in the New Testament is, "And the children of the Kingdom shall be cast out." All of us who regard ourselves as the chosen of God, and choose not God and his Christ and cause, will be cast out.

The most encouraging verse is the word of John, the forerunner of a time like this one coming. "For God can out of these stones raise up children unto Abraham"; and as God did then reject the chosen and chose the rejected, and history started its *Anno Domini*, ushered in by tentmakers, fishermen, and publicans, so the hand of God will again gather the seemingly worthless and make them of eternal worth to the imperishable cause of Christ. For his cause will not perish; the church will not perish if she is enwrapt in a great cause, "a prisoner of Jesus Christ" in behalf of humanity, now without hope and without worth in the world.

# Germany's Great Defeat

HARVIE BRANSCOMB

OUT of the confusion and strife which have characterized the economic and political life of Germany during the past fifteen months one fact emerges more and more clearly—that the democratic, liberalistic, Wilsonian ideals which came to the front in post-war Germany have been unable to hold their own and have succumbed. Fourteen years after the Armistice which we celebrated so riotously, long after the unveiling of the war memorials and the distribution of the captured cannon, even after the A. E. F. had traded its domestic reputation for a bonus, America lost its war. For we went to war, not to save our investments, as a distinguished American told Europe and it has believed ever since, but fundamentally because we believed we had done all that we could to keep out and had become involved in a struggle which the German military machine had forced upon us. We were not fighting the German people but the war lords and the Junkers. The world had to be made safe for democracy.

These idealistic hopes and aims were gratified to an unexpected degree. The war machine collapsed and the Kaiser fled. In place of the imperial government a republic was set up. Within a few months, in accordance with the Treaty of Versailles the German army was disbanded and her fleet sunk. For the first time in their history the German people were ruled by a government subject to the popular will, and for the first time in the history of the world there appeared a state of the first rank dependent solely upon reason and persuasion for its security among the nations.

The people on this side of the Atlantic never quite appreciated the significance and promise of the new German republic. Founded by the combined efforts of the Youth Movement and the organizations of German workers, its constitution modeled on the best forms of Western parliamentary government and formally adopted in Weimar in the shadow of Goethe's spirit, it endeavored to eliminate the old guard from control, to free the Reich from the generals and the admirals, and to devote powers of the state to the interests of the people as a whole. The new republic carried on the social insurance of the empire. Sickness insurance, unemployment insurance, old-age pensions are universal. Wages are fixed by agreements between employers, trade unions and the state. The universities have been opened to the sons and daughters of the working class to a greater degree than formerly. In international affairs the Treaty of Versailles

was accepted—with the exception of the war guilt clause—and an effort made to carry out its provisions, save where these could be modified by peaceful negotiation. The disarmament requirements were not evaded. Reparations were paid, though with much groaning and gnashing of teeth. The Locarno treaties, in which England, France and Germany agreed never again to attempt to recover territory from each other by force of arms—a treaty in which obviously Germany was the one which was doing the promising—were negotiated by Stresemann with the government's approval and acceptance.

In two respects the new republic held out the promise of an outstanding contribution to modern life. In the first place, the Social-Democratic Party, which directed the government, professed Marxian doctrines but declared that socialism must be achieved through democracy and the free choice of the people. In other words, the majority opinion of Germany had refused to follow the path of red Russia but at the same time frankly avowed its belief that the structure of modern society on its economic side must be profoundly though slowly modified. Such an experiment in the gradual modification of our present capitalistic system carried out by the intelligent, hard-working, frugal, and above all, individualistic German citizenry was of tremendous significance for the rest of the world. In the second place the fact of the German people situated in the middle of Europe, completely disarmed and maintaining a pacific attitude toward other nations, would have been an object lesson, had it continued, which would have done more to convince the world of the absurdity of tanks and battleships and millions of soldiers than anything else.

In the last few months this republic, founded in the shadow of Goethe's spirit and devoted to the welfare of the people as a whole, has been virtually swept away by the forces of reaction and nationalism. This is a disaster of the first magnitude to those who still believe that no satisfactory alternative to democracy has yet been found, that armaments are a mistake, and that our present industrial machine must come more and more under government control. It has taken place because a sufficient number of the German people had been carried beyond the point of calm endurance and had ceased to believe that the power of reason and persuasion would be sufficient to repair the nation's fortunes. Political changes have only mirrored this popular conviction. That is the real tragedy in the present situation, that the German people who in 1918 rejoiced to see the Kaiser and all he stood for disappear, who even cast a majority vote for the confiscation of his huge personal fortune, who refused to follow Hitler's call

for rebellion in 1923, the very year of the inflation, have in 1932 become convinced that his or other methods of violence are the only effective means of national salvation. The Germans are not Jew-hunters nor vindictive nationalists by nature. The background of this national change of belief needs to be understood in all its biting sharpness. After some twelve months in Germany I take the liberty of setting down a few facts and observations. I do this the more freely because on returning to America I find in the press the most varied accounts of the German situation. Perhaps I should say at the outset that I have no German ancestry or connections, being British and French by descent, that I went to Germany with no preconceived opinions on politics, being chiefly annoyed that the disturbed situation would interrupt my peaceful academic pursuits.

Physically and superficially Germany is as lovely as she has always been. The cathedral of Cologne, the Altstadt of Frankfort, the fresh, clean green of the spotlessly neat countryside, the picturesque costumes of the Bavarian men and the Hessian women, the hundred and one other delights of the not too rapid traveler, have been untouched by the current confusion. The traffic in the streets rolls on as usual, the flower women still sell their colorful wares on the busy corners, the beer restaurants still furnish countless newspapers to thirsty but more economically minded patrons, the housemaids beat their rugs in the early morning hours as of yore. But as soon as one begins to get acquainted with German men and women one meets with an almost universal fact—their standard of living has declined markedly from what it was. In the case of the working classes this decline in the standard of living is related to the growth of unemployment during the last five years. With the middle and upper classes the process began with the period of inflation and has been continuing ever since.

Of those who lost their savings in 1923 the more pathetic cases are those who are unable to work, the crippled, the untrained, the elderly. These, however, may be regarded as part of the aftermath of the war. More important for the understanding of the temper of the nation are the multitudinous cases of those who adjusted their scale of living to their new circumstances only to see the slackening of industry, the growth of unemployment, the burden of reparations (actual and psychological), increasing taxation, and the loss of confidence in the future of their country, require further and further sacrifices.

A typical case was that of Oberst-Lieutenant B——, and his wife, with

whom my wife and I exchanged conversation for a while. Both were people of culture and refinement, who had formerly possessed considerable means. He was still in his prime, a man who had won various distinctions during the war. Trained for only one occupation, he, like most of his fellow officers, has had nothing to do since 1919. His property and his wife's, invested in securities, were wiped out in the inflation. Except for a meager pension, recently reduced a second time, he was penniless. They had moved into a cheaper apartment. Frau Oberst was doing her own housework, which means something in Germany, where maids can be secured for as little as twenty marks monthly. A son had had to forego the university and felt himself lucky to get a clerical job at a beginner's salary. There was a charming daughter of about twenty who could expect no marriage settlement and had no prospects. The Colonel saw no help in sight. He was a determined follower of Adolf Hitler. The case was in no way abnormal; in its larger aspects it could be multiplied literally by the million.

Slightly different is the story of Frau S——, my landlady for a time. In her youth she had been on the stage and one could still see that she had been talented. After a marriage which had not turned out successfully she had supported herself and daughter and, later, her husband also, by operating a reasonable-priced pension. At times, by hard work and those economies of which American housewives have no suspicion, she had done fairly well and had paid for the furniture with which the house was equipped. But slowly she was overcome by the general difficulty in which the whole community was engulfed. People could not pay what they had formerly. Travelers were fewer. Many people were leaving the city. The costs of operation remained high. Taxes took all the profits. At fifty-five, sick with heart trouble and worried over her daughter who, though very talented, had no work and no prospects of any, Frau S—— confessed that she was watching a lifetime of struggle and effort end in poverty and disgrace.

Neither of these people belonged to the ranks of active business. But the same story of increasing difficulties, higher taxes and lower returns comes from those engaged in trade. Around the corner from where I lived in Berlin was a glass cutter's shop. The proprietor will tell you proudly that the shop was established by his grandfather and has been doing business in the same place for fifty years. Formerly he employed thirty people in one capacity or another. Now there is scarcely enough work to keep himself busy. He insisted one day on showing his books.



So far in the week—it was Thursday—he had taken in thirty marks, which barely covered the price of materials. He has four sons out of work. He isn't radical at heart. "Some people blame the Jews," he said, "but they are just as bad off as the rest of us." "Something has got to happen," was his only contribution to the general political problem.

I was interested in the point of view of the German youth. In Marburg I stayed in a private house in which three students also lived. All of them were far above the average in ability, literary and artistic interest and training, the sort of students whom in this country we would encourage to go in for academic careers. Frau Schumacher, my hostess, told me that only one of the three had as much as 50 RM. a month for all expenses. One of these boys was the son of a government official whose salary had been cut three times, so that no money was left over for university education. The father of the opulent one had a good position in the Berlin school system and was the editor of a small magazine. There were some dependent relatives, however, whose needs were so imperative as to have first claim on any surplus funds in the family. The third was the son of a small business man. These three students ate only one regular meal per day. The other two meals they fed themselves out of stores of black bread and cheese which they good humoredly brought to the table in large tin boxes. The evening meal, which they could not afford, cost eighty-five pfennigs, or about twenty cents, the morning meal less. Normally all three would have expected to go through the university without hardship. No one of the three had any prospects of a position when they completed their examinations this fall. When I left they were investigating the possibilities of teaching in a boarding school for small children, where they at least would receive their keep. All three are ardent Nazis. When I commented one afternoon to Frau Schumacher on my disappointment that so soon after the sacrifices of the great war so many younger men were ready to fight again, she replied, "It would be a war of desperation."

Such stories as these could be multiplied, illustrating the situation now from this side, now from that. At present there are six millions out of work. During the winter—I do not have more recent figures for this item—there were three million more who earned less than those on the dole and were therefore entitled to government help. The Labor Office calculates an average of two dependents to every person unemployed. On this basis between twenty-five and thirty millions or about 40 per cent of the total population are dependent upon the government for sustenance. Reduce that figure by a third, if one will, and a situation still exists which will

tax any government to the uttermost. To meet the emergency the government attempted heroic measures. The burden fell, of course, upon those who still had means. Taxes have about reached the limit both in numbers and in rates. If one practices a trade one pays seven kinds of taxes, otherwise six. Income taxes begin with incomes of 1,300 RM. per year, at a rate of 10 per cent, with deductions for dependents which we would regard as negligible. In North Carolina I pay a tax of \$12.50 on a Ford car. In Germany the same car pays \$75, besides a customs duty which collects about 17 cents a gallon on gasoline. It is no wonder that this year very nearly half of all the automobiles in Berlin were withdrawn from use. Salaries of government officials have been cut three times. My postman said that his cut amounted to 19 per cent. University professors have been reduced as much as 25 per cent. Wages throughout the country were cut 10 per cent at one fell swoop last December by government decree. What reductions had preceded that I do not know. Up until I left a month ago, the cost of living had not been brought down proportionately.

In America we have had our own taste of a major economic depression, but there are two differences between our depression and that of the Germans. Ours has lasted two years and the return of good times is heralded from afar. The German situation, which began in 1918, after four years of war, saw the currency of the country become valueless in '23 and, with the exception of a short-lived and specious recovery on borrowed money, has lasted ever since. After eighteen years of continuous struggle, and with world forces of various sorts apparently arrayed against them, the Germans have ceased expecting the coming of good times. The flight of capital from the country, which had to be stopped by an embargo against taking or sending money out of the country except through the Reichsbank, shows the situation. More revealing still is the fact that the government cannot borrow money from its own people. Last fall a bond issue was floated through the Reichsbank. In order to secure subscribers it was felt necessary to attach an amnesty clause to the bonds promising immunity from prosecution for defrauding the government over taxes to all who would buy. Discouragement and pessimism has affected the making of personal plans. The student groups are pessimistic. With six million already out of work they see no prospects ahead except for the more fortunate of them. One student group has already endorsed a proposal to retire government officials at the age of sixty in order to make room for the younger generation. The medical student body has petitioned the Ministry of Education to license no more than 1,500 medical practitioners a year. In Berlin

we had a most excellent housemaid. My wife said something to her one day about the possibility of her marrying. "*Nein, gnädige Frau,*" was the answer, "We maids do not dare marry. We have work now and can probably always get it. But if we married and had children we would be dependent on our husbands, and if they get out of work we would all be ruined." A very intelligent woman of about thirty-five, a doctor of philosophy, and the head of a successful school, summed up the situation one day with the remark, "We Germans have no more any hope—only courage." In similar vein the lecturer on sociology in one of the universities answered my cheering remarks to the effect that things must soon get better by saying that, in his opinion, the present economic depression in Germany would last about fifty years.

It is against such a background that one must understand the growth of the nationalist movement. For the German collapse is due fundamentally to international factors—the Treaty of Versailles in the first place and to the policy of the victors since 1918 in the second. The penalties of the Treaty the Germans accepted, at least for a time. That they have at length been swept away by a nationalist fever fourteen years after the Armistice, is due to the belief of an increasing number of Germans that the French are resolved by one means or another to prevent a German recovery.

The grounds on which they base this conviction are the well-known points of Franco-German friction during the last ten years and need not be repeated. Largest in the German mind loom the amount and duration of reparations payments, French obstruction of such proposals for German relief as the Austro-German customs and the Hoover Moratorium, and, perhaps most of all, the French and Polish refusals to do away with the huge armies and air fleets which are poised upon the frontiers of a disarmed Germany.

Fervid nationalism has fed on economic misery. All Hitler had to do was to go up and down the country booming out in his great voice that Germany was being betrayed to her enemies by the same Marxian traitors and international-minded Jews who had stabbed her in the back in the last years of the war, and have been battenning on her prostrate body ever since. The socialist government, he charged, had always yielded to the enemy instead of calling upon the Fatherland to rise in the strength of her Nordic citizenry, throw off the hated yoke, tear up the Treaty of Versailles, take back the lost colonies, and stand refulgent before the nations. The honest German working man has starved while unpatriotic Jews have

feasted and grown fat. Germany must be for Germans rather than for traitors and communists.

Hitler's movement is primarily nationalistic, and his attack on the government has been directed constantly against its management of foreign affairs. His economic program for the rehabilitation of Germany is general and vague, aside from the negative one of the elimination of foreign interference in German affairs and the most intense opposition to communism. This latter, however, has fitted well the position of the Nazis as the party in opposition, for the republican leaders professed socialist principles. Within the last year "The Movement" has even made inroads on the trades-union bodies which have constituted the backbone of the republican strength.

The sequel to the story is of recent occurrence and need not be retold. The Brüning government fell, undermined by the nationalist movement, but actually overthrown by the Junkers and landowners of East Prussia, who convinced "Papa" Hindenburg that his man Brüning had run wild on social and economic matters. It is undeniable that a strong drift to the right had taken place. The socialist government was identified with the nation's misfortunes. With the resignation of Brüning Hindenburg appointed a cabinet of aristocrats, with von Papen at its head. Since the general elections which followed produced no majority for any party—the Nazis securing 37 per cent of the vote—and since Germany is divided, confused and uncertain, it seems likely that the group associated with the names of von Papen and von Schleicher will remain in power. The latter indeed has been quoted as saying, "We expect to be here for some time."

The change in the spirit and purpose of the state which this means is perfectly clear. Von Papen himself is a member of the old guard whose activities as military attaché to the German embassy in Washington in the early days of the war are well remembered. He is a landowner and an aristocrat. Baron von Gayl is a true Junker from East Prussia. General von Schleicher was one of the staff officers of General Ludendorf. The new ministry has been labeled a Junker "cabinet of monocles."

Its attitude toward social questions has been made quite clear. The cabinet came in as a repudiation of the land-settlement scheme. In his outline of the economic program of the government von Papen emphasized its unqualified espousal of free private initiative and the repudiation of everything which smacks of socialism. What will happen to the Weimar Constitution may be guessed from the following incident: On the anni-

versary of the adoption of the constitution Baron von Gayl, as Minister of the Interior delivered the customary address of the day. He did not once use the word republic. On the subject of the constitution he delivered the following: "The Weimar Constitution is the only house the German people have to live in and it has proven woefully inadequate." A number of newspapers headlined their story of the proceedings with the caption: "Last Constitution Day."

With reference to the army the purpose of the government is clearly understood. Von Schleicher was one of the group who brought about the repeal of the decree against the Hitler Storm-troops. He has already diplomatically served notice on the world that, in view of the failure of the ex-Allies to disarm in accordance with the treaty only one course is left to Germany, namely, to rebuild her army.

The new government has given hints of going further. Baron von Gayl, shortly after the von Papen ministry took office, sent out a feeler. In a public address he expressed it as his own opinion that the form of government best suited to the German people is the one they have always known, namely, the monarchy. This seems to represent the opinion of the majority of the cabinet, though they will proceed carefully and slowly. Von Papen has declared that he stands—over against Hitler—for "a constitutional commonwealth of the people and an authorization conduct of the government," but it is quite likely that he will find that the latter requires a return to the monarchy. Prominent French leaders have prophesied a return of the Hohenzollerns by next spring. If so, it will more than likely be the Crown Prince. The Kaiser is not loved by the Germans, but the Crown Prince, contrary to American opinion, is very popular.

Thus the picture is complete. Without the firing of a shot the old guard has come back into the saddle and will probably not be ousted. The return of the military class, the repudiation of all that smacks of socialism, even possibly the return of a Kaiser and his sword-rattling speeches, seems the order of the day. The German people in their desperation were split into four irreconcilable factions—communists, socialists, fascists and monarchists. Perhaps amid such confusion Hindenburg had no other alternative than to turn to the small group of strong individuals who gave promise of establishing order—even if it be the old order. The new government will probably put an end to the present civil turmoil so far as it is humanely possible. It may be able to assist a business recovery. It is my guess that it will get rid of Hitler either by taking over his twin theses of rebuilding the army and opposing communism, or by goading him to some act of



desperation that will prove his undoing. But it is certain that we can expect from it no great contribution toward a new social order and no belief in the security which reason and justice afford. If the latter belief should not be evident in German minds in the next generation the outside world should remember that it was born but died for lack of nourishment.

Thus the mildly socialistic, basically pacifist workers' republic seems to have come to an end, though the form of the republic may continue for the present. Its downfall is due to the policy of greed and fear on the part of the victors in the war. How much we in America must share the blame may be disputed. Having fought the war in the name of democracy, we then declared that we had no interest in Europe, and tried to forget it until the Great Depression made us realize anew that we are involved in whatever happens in Europe. If that is so, our national policy needs to take stock again. We may now congratulate ourselves on having almost completely lost our last war. If we have any faith and any idealism left after the débacle of the last fourteen years, they must be formulated anew in terms of a foreign policy. When that is done, Germany, the bulwark of western Christian civilization and the major battleground of the forces struggling for the mastery of modern life, will be the object of our greatest interest and sympathy.

# The Religious Note in Robert Frost

GORHAM MUNSON

A FEW years ago an interesting essayist wrote me for a list of American writers who were affiliated with churches. After a while I was able to compile a list, albeit a very brief one. There were Paul Elmer More, of course, and G. R. Elliott, whose *Cycle of Modern Poetry* was then unpublished, and T. S. Eliot, celebrated for his Anglo-Catholicism, and the late Grant Overton, who had been converted to Catholicism, and, most curious of all, James Branch Cabell, who has advertised his membership in the Protestant Episcopal Church. There were a few others, principally in the Catholic faith, but it was very plain that the writing profession in America was almost completely cut away from the institutions of religion. This, however, is part of a general tendency to cut away from all institutions; one has only to think of Matthew Arnold, who worked inside the leading religious, political, educational, and social institutions of his time, a regenerating force intimate with the great structures of Victorian society, and then think of the typical American writer of to-day, outside of political parties, outside of organized education, outside of the community's clubs, outside of the community's churches, to realize to what a length free-lancing has been carried. Whether it is occasion for regret or for justification, such is the state of affairs. The practice of letters is not now an integral part of the communal life.

According to some critics, chief among them J. Middleton Murry in England, ever since the Renaissance the spirit of true religion has been shifting over from organized religion to the laymen of letters; and it must be admitted that Mr. Murry is very persuasive in arguing the case, which he bases on Keats, Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, Melville and other great writers. Walt Whitman had a similar notion of a priestly function for letters, expressed, as my readers know, in *Democratic Vistas*. Yet it is very hard for me to swallow Mr. Murry's thesis when he himself presents it: Mr. Murry at crucial moments drip with *religiosity* or the undisciplined sentiments of the religiously inclined but not religiously matured.

Yet I should say that Henry David Thoreau was a definitely and genuinely religious man. He severed himself rather defiantly from formal religious observances and he even went far out of his way to attack the churches. However, it must be noted that some men attack formal religion through impatience with what seems to them the inadequacy of formal

religion's answers to religious problems. No one could have been more keenly interested in the cardinal riddles and problems of true religion than was Thoreau, and, what is more, he devoted his life to trying to live out suitable answers. There is no doubt left after reading his Journals where his center of gravity was: it was in the search for a religious meaning of the cosmos.

It never occurred to me when I replied to my inquiring essayist to mention Robert Frost as a religious writer, and in fact Mr. Frost holds a membership in no church. Nor can I speak confidently about him as I did just above about Thoreau, and specify his center of gravity. I do not think it possible to call him a religious poet at all, using the term with any strictness, but in all strictness there is to be heard occasionally in his verse a religious note.

I should like to know what Mr. Frost had been reading when he composed a certain poem in his first volume, *A Boy's Will*. Plato? Or was it inspiring memories of Santayana's lectures at Harvard? In any case, "Trial by Existence,"<sup>1</sup> as the poem is called, is very different from the other poems in his first collection. It pictures in its opening stanza the surprise of the dead in heaven

"to find that the utmost reward  
Of daring should be still to dare."

Then follows a picture of heaven which shows that Mr. Frost is equal to the Pre-Raphaelites:

The light of heaven falls whole and white  
And is not shattered into dyes,  
The light for ever is morning light;  
The hills are verdured pasture-wise;  
The angel hosts with freshness go,  
And seek with laughter what to brave;  
And binding all is the hushed snow  
Of the far-distant breaking wave.

The poet next describes the gathering of souls for birth, and it will be noted that he adopts the immemorial religious view of earthly life, "the trial by existence named, the obscuration upon earth." The poem then describes the souls volunteering for life on earth and finally God addresses them:

One thought in agony of strife  
The bravest would have by for friend,  
The memory that he chose the life;

---

<sup>1</sup> Page 28, *Collected Poems*, by Robert Frost. Henry Holt & Company, New York.

But the pure fate to which you go  
Admits no memory of choice,  
Or the woe were not earthly woe  
To which you give the assenting voice.

That is, the condition of earthly existence is a forgetting of the fact that one's soul has volunteered for it. Then beautifully the poet says that

God has taken a flower of gold  
And broken it, and used therefrom  
The mystic link to bind and hold  
Spirit to matter till death come.

The last stanza reads thus:

'Tis of the essence of life here,  
Though we choose greatly, still to lack  
The lasting memory at all clear,  
That life has for us on the wrack  
Nothing but what we somehow chose;  
Thus are we wholly stripped of pride  
In the pain that has but one close,  
Bearing it crushed and mystified.

This poem sounds what I call the religious note of Robert Frost.

Yet, as I have remarked, Mr. Frost is not a religious or devotional poet in the sense that George Herbert is. During his course of lectures at the New School for Social Research, Mr. Frost declared in his delightful impromptu manner that "the spiritual part of a poem is that which takes place between you and yourself." How different this is from Aldous Huxley, who once said that a religious emotion is a rich feeling in the pit of the stomach: Frost is not among the horde of present-day naturalists, merging psychology into physiology and man into nature. But also how different is his statement from a religious person's; the emotion of creature toward creator is the spiritual part of a poem, such a person would say. Mr. Frost is firmly in the center: nourished by the classics, he walks upright between the ranks of the disillusioned naturalists and the frank defenders of religion. He has retained his faith in man, and would doubtless assert with a recent English writer that man is what the Schoolmen called a Real Kind, summing up nature and endowed with certain "absolutes," such as conscience, implanted in him.

Now one who possesses this kind of faith is bound to take religion seriously and to sympathize with its aims, and it is not surprising to learn that as Mr. Frost has ripened his personal interest in religious reflection has grown. I invite the reader to consider three poems from *West-Running*

*Brook*, Mr. Frost's latest collection, for in them the religious note is heard again. The poems are "Once by the Pacific,"<sup>3</sup> "Sitting by a Bush in Broad Daylight,"<sup>4</sup> and "Bereft."<sup>5</sup> The first of these, which I analyzed at length in my biography of Mr. Frost, rings with a kind of Old Testament sense of doom:

There would be more than ocean-water broken  
Before God's last *Put out the Light* was spoken.

The second I shall quote in full:

When I spread out my hand here to-day,  
I catch no more than a ray  
To feel of between thumb and fingers;  
No lasting effect of it lingers.

There was one time and only the one  
When dust really took in the sun;  
And from that one intake of fire  
All creatures still warmly suspire.

And if men have watched a long time  
And never seen sun-smitten slime  
Again come to life and crawl off,  
We must not be too ready to scoff.

God once declared he was true  
And then took the veil and withdrew,  
And remember how final a hush  
Then descended of old on the bush.

God once spoke to people by name.  
The sun once imparted its flame.  
One impulse persists as our breath;  
The other persists as our faith.

The third poem, "Bereft," shows us quite conclusively where Mr. Frost stands to-day. The music life makes has for him deepened and taken on the tragic tones, and simultaneously he has been manfully exhausting his resources. Here is the poem, a very important one for the complete understanding of this poet:

Where had I heard this wind before  
Change like this to a deeper roar?  
What would it take my standing there for,  
Holding open a restive door,  
Looking down hill to a frothy shore?  
Summer was past and day was past.  
Sombre clouds in the west were massed.

<sup>3</sup> *Collected Poems*, by Robert Frost, p. 314.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 342.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 317.



Out in the porch's sagging floor,  
Leaves got up in a coil and hissed,  
Blindly struck at my knee and missed.  
Something sinister in the tone  
Told me my secret must be known:  
Word I was in the house alone  
Somehow must have gotten abroad,  
Word I was in my life alone,  
Word I had no one left but God.

It is a powerful poem, susceptible equally to a restricted, almost literal interpretation and to a wide interpretation stressing the essential aloneness of each person in confronting the darker mysteries of human life.

It is tempting to make such a poem the point of departure for a discussion of the modern consciousness and religion. We have inherited the Renaissance tradition of self-reliance, but gradually the modern world has lost the complement of self-reliance which is humility, until we reach our own cocky period, a period which G. K. Chesterton characterizes as knowing the last word about everything but the first word about nothing. Self-reliance consists in that rigorous and honest keeping of accounts with oneself of which the greater part of Mr. Frost's verse is a distinguished example. Humility is reached when in the crises of life

Word I was in the house alone  
Somehow must have gotten abroad,  
Word I was in my life alone,  
Word I had no one left but God.

Such a recognition is the beginning of religion, and there are signs that the next great movement of the Western mind will be based on this recognition.

# Can We Honestly Be Optimists?

HENRY T. HODGKIN

## A

**P**UT two men in precisely the same circumstances and present them with the same facts—one will view the situation hopefully while the other will despair of it. Why the difference? It is an old problem for which some find a solution in the body, the ductless glands, the nervous system; others in the elusive thing called temperament; others in their past history; others in their philosophy of life. There seems to be an unusually strong tendency to-day to claim that only a person who wilfully or stupidly ignores the facts can be anything but pessimistic in regard to human society. The optimist is classed as either superficial or self-deluded. Prevailing opinion puts him on the defensive.

This temper is to be found within the churches almost as much as outside them. Religion, which should provide grounds for triumphant hope, has too often found herself sorrowing as if there were none, seeing clearly tendencies toward evil but lacking the confidence that in her own armory she has the weapons wherewith to overthrow them. Christian is once again in Doubting Castle, unable to find the key that would set him free.

Dark Ages are no new feature in history. Mankind has emerged from them because some men have seen a light and pushed on bravely toward it. To call ours a Dark Age, with all the blaze of scientific enlightenment, with all the experiments in social life, with all the advances in international thinking that are characteristic of to-day, would seem to be very much beside the mark. If, however, the one true Light of all our seeing be a living God, and if the measure of our progress be in the things of the spirit, perhaps there is more truth than we should like to think in the view that we live in a Dark Age. In any case, whether we be hopeful or hopeless about the modern world, it may not be beside the mark to review some of the grounds on which honest men and women have been optimists in ages at least as dark as ours.

## I

In the first place men have dared to hope because *they have seen an ideal which they believed to be in whole or in part realizable*. Simply to see a vision of good against which we match this "sorry state of things" may be the beginning of cynicism and despair. Our vision needs to be, at least in

parts, concrete enough and near enough to enlist our service, and, as we work for it, the mood of despondency passes into one of good cheer. Herein lies the strength of the Russian Five Year Plans. "A world-wide socialist commonwealth" may stir for a while, but unless the young communist can see steps which he can take toward its realization his mind is likely enough to settle on the stupendous obstacles to be overcome and on the grave possibility of failure. Is it not thus with our presentation of the kingdom of God as an ideal to work for? Stated in general terms it may stir for a moment, but seen as a call to clean up this situation, to forgive this enemy, to help this man out of the gutter, it will prove, as it has so often done in the past, a basis for a hopeful view of life.

We are swamped in generalities; and too often we step out on them, thinking them fine strong ground, only to sink deeper into a bog from which the only escape is to get back to concrete jobs. The man who is doing these, with a vision in his heart of where his service will lead out, is far less likely to be a pessimist than he who contents himself with vague ideas. He may indeed be meeting terrific obstacles, he may fail repeatedly in his effort, but he will see some things happening before his eyes and will know that,

"Far off, through creek and inlet making,  
Comes silent flooding in the main."

## II

A second sure ground of optimism is the conviction that *there are some unchangeable principles in the moral and spiritual sphere*. In the days when evolution was a word to conjure with there was a tendency to enlarge the field of its applicability almost indefinitely. The magic word "relativity" has suffered more recently in the same way. It is called upon to cover too much. If all obligations are relative and shifting, if no principle has absolute value, the roots of optimism are cut away. We are not talking now of the light-hearted who can say "cheerio" under all circumstances, but of the great optimists whose hope is like an anchor of the soul. These are they who will pass through fire and water, who will face death or isolation or misunderstanding with an unshaken confidence that some things abide and can be counted on whatever happens.

These foundations may be differently conceived and stated at different times and by different people. But in the simplest terms they would perhaps be included in the conviction that there is an eternal difference between

truth and falsehood, between love and hate, between righteousness and injustice, between purity and uncleanness and that it can never cease to matter on which side we stand, as individuals or as a society. No true optimism can grow out of the slurring of these distinctions. To see clearly where we are and what is the nature of the highest human quest is essential.

### III

But this seems to me in itself insufficient, though an essential element in any sane optimism. To it must be added the *conviction that the universe is on the side of these unchanging values*. At times we are driven to admit that the hold of these eternal principles upon the minds of men is lessened. A generation grows up in revolt against what seems to it to be meaningless restraints. Only by bitter experience does it learn that the good life, even the happy life, cannot be reached save through disciplines which in themselves are irksome. At these periods of moral recession the optimist sustains his faith, not by ignoring the signs of the times, but by a deep-rooted conviction that there is something in the structure of the universe that supports the highest values we know, that falsehood and cruelty and lust are self-defeating. For my part I find this faith through the ever-deepening conviction that there is a God to whom what we call our "human" values matter supremely, and who is seeking expression through persons who will accept and live by them. An utterly impersonal "First Cause" supplies me with no foundation for optimism. I am left guessing as to whether the things that matter to me and to those whose lives have counted in what I conceive as true progress, may not often all be engaged in an essentially hopeless struggle doomed to end in tragic failure.

### IV

Convictions such as we have considered may lead to a theoretical optimism associated with practical pessimism. But this is not likely to be the case where *the mind and spirit of a man are growing as he meets new situations*. The stagnant personality, the man or woman who assumes that he has already arrived, the closed mind and the unadventurous spirit lead sooner or later, whatever the philosophy that is professed, to an attitude of discouragement about the world in which we live. We can keep our optimism only as something goes on happening in us, enlarging our mind, deepening our faith, enriching our whole personality. This process of growth in oneself gives one a real confidence that others can grow, what happens to us leads us to expect something to happen in society. It is the

evidence, if you like, of divine activity brought to bear upon this sluggish me. When I meet a demand which seems overwhelming and find myself lifted "above myself" to do what I had not supposed I was capable of, when a sudden need is revealed and as suddenly reveals hidden possibilities in me, I get something more than a deep satisfaction that I have not failed. My hope for the world in which I live and for the men and women around me is strangely reinforced. The tide of pessimism is driven back.

## V

Such, it would seem to me, are the eternal springs of any genuine optimism. Let us be quite honest with ourselves in order that we may see whether the temper of our age has been allowed to dry up or poison these springs. Very subtly, to change our metaphor, have the "acids of modernity" eaten into some of the things we assumed we were sure of. Few, I think, are able to build a new faith for the future on the foundations suggested by Walter Lippmann, or at least to find in them a reason for optimism such as will sustain them during the darker days. Very interesting and provocative as his treatment is, how far short it falls of the triumphant shout of, let us say, the Forty-sixth Psalm! Can we quite honestly use to-day those time-honored words? Must we confess that while they stir our pulses, they fall short of convincing our minds? "Therefore will we not fear though the earth be removed, and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea." Is this optimism to be pitied as a huge self-delusion, even while we cannot fail to admire something splendid in its quiet assurance?

We have every right, when things seem to go wrong, to stress the more hopeful elements in a situation, and in a moment we may turn and look at some of these. They may prove to be a useful reminder of the fact that we need a fresh sense of proportion and a longer historical perspective than is common in these days. They may lift us out of the valley of depression and set our feet for awhile on the breezy hillside. But before taking this health-giving journey to the heights let us pause long enough to realize that the great believers in the future have found inspiration in the inward rather than in the outward gaze. For by looking within they have discovered the evidence of the eternal—"the beyond that is within"—and they have been refreshed by the springs that never fail. The psalmist summons the doubter in words that show clearly where his confidence came from: "Be still and know that I am God." And a still greater interpreter of the human spirit spoke of the water that would be in a man as "a well of



water springing up into everlasting life." The very fountain and source of hope is within because it is in the human soul that God makes himself known.

But we dare not be still. Rushing from this theory to that, from this teacher or book to the next, from one activity to another, what chance is there for the soul to find itself and its God and so to discover the fountain of hope? We are called by the pessimist to be honest enough to face unpleasant facts. Are we honest enough to face our own failure to be still and know? Have we dwelt long enough in the presence of the most significant of all facts—God as revealed in the innermost recesses of a man's heart?

## B

Having examined some of the deeper sources of optimism, we may proceed to a study of the world situation which so many assume to be a justification for their pessimism. Behind that assumption there lies, in most cases no doubt, an attitude to life very different from that which we have been describing. However, the ostensible ground for discouragement is so often stated to be facts of contemporary life that we cannot evade a consideration of them. Are they as dark as we are led to believe? Is this profession of superior honesty in facing them in part a perverse selection from all the facts, a blackening in of the darker and a washing out of the brighter, so that the whole picture is dismal beyond words? I think the charge can be maintained against certain would-be interpreters of life, and if, in what follows, I am chargeable with the opposite error it will be because I believe the balance needs to be redressed in the interests of truth. I am conscious of picking out hopeful elements, but I believe that for most of my readers the dark background is already sufficiently evident.

## I

The progress of scientific discovery and invention may seem, from the point of view of man's spiritual welfare, to be but a doubtful gain. Wealth, power, comfort, the satisfaction of functioning in new and larger ways have certainly come with bewildering rapidity. But the doubt constantly assails us as to whether we have grown in moral and spiritual stature rapidly enough to make these things more of a help than a danger. The point has so often been debated that I do not intend here to take up one side or the other. It is enough to make the claim that there have never been a larger number of people sincerely and eagerly engaged in the search for

truth than there are to-day. For many that search may be limited to what we call the material universe. Yet if the material be the garment of the spiritual can the search end with the former? Already we see clearly that it cannot. Even though an Eddington or a Millikan or a Lodge may (confessedly) be still groping his way through the one to the other, is it not a stupendous and enormously hopeful fact that such men, in their study of the physical, find themselves already on the confines of the spiritual world?

We cannot doubt that truth is one and that any genuine search for truth gives hope both for the searching individual and for the race. Those of us who hold that the supreme reality is a God who cannot be less than personal and who is the source of supreme value in the universe, cannot look without a joyous expectation upon unprejudiced seeking for that which is reliable and real. Of course some of this seeking, while freed from one set of prejudices, is hampered by another, and which of us can boast the absence of all unconscious bias? But, by and large, in spite of all the cherished beliefs or superstitions that fall, or seem to fall, by the way, we have a splendidly hopeful factor in contemporary civilization. Looking at the historical witness of other periods where truth from some fresh quarter broke rudely into mankind's self-contented slumber, can we hesitate as to how we estimate the quest for truth in our own generation?

## II

Turn from the field of thought to that of our social relations. Was there ever a time when mankind was more obviously on the march toward a juster and happier social order? Some of the experiments that are being tried may seem to us so menacing that we fail to catch the most significant fact, namely, that they are experiments and that behind them lies that deep discontent with old injustices, which is far better than blindness on the one hand or sullen acceptance on the other. Few indeed are those who are really satisfied with the results of our "acquisitive society," shown up as it is by the millions of unemployed, by the dependence of the vast majority upon the acts or the will of the privileged few, by over-production and maldistribution.

I know that very many who care for the spiritual interests of the race are deeply distressed, not to say discouraged, to think that the most considerable social experiment of our day and perhaps of all time is tied up with an aggressive atheism. But even in this matter we should be careful of hasty conclusions. Were not the positive values for which the French

Revolution contended a greater influence, in the end, upon the human race than the religious negations? Is it not a matter of deep thankfulness to see a sustained effort to build up a society in which the motive shall not be private gain, and where our false values of wealth and social prestige are boldly set at nought? Of course, in the heat of a new enthusiasm many things are said and done which, from our level-headed and unemotional standpoint, can be shown up as foolish and wrong. So was it when Luther and Calvin and Knox swept aside old abuses, and along with them things of beauty and value. No great passionate uprising of the human spirit but has brought in its train desolation and a sense of despair to the high-brow critic. But how often has it proved that God was in the movement though his servants knew it not! How blind were the "best men" of the day to the supremely great revolution of the first century of our era!

It is through experiments that men of science have moved forward, sometimes through their success, more often through their failure. Whether it be a Fascist, or a Bolshevik experiment, or a more cautious one like that of the Consumers' Co-operative, it would seem that in a world so far from perfect, it is better that men should try their hands at new and daring adjustments than that they should let things drift in the hope that something better may turn up. If we have the insight to profit from our mistakes as well as from our achievements, and to dissect the good from the bad in these varied efforts toward a better world, there is certainly reason for hope in the very wide variety as well as in the large scale of and in the persistent continuance in the experiments now being carried out. Above all, let us not look cynically at them and say they are doomed to fail because, forsooth, human nature cannot or does not change. Stagnation and indifference seem to me grounds for a far deeper pessimism than change of any kind in what is confessedly a profoundly unsatisfactory situation. The change may be in what we call the wrong direction, but even so it will demonstrate its own weakness if carried through with thoroughness.

### III

In the wide field of international relations the pessimist finds plenty to nourish his lean soul. The nations have trodden since the war a strange and devious course strewn with disappointed hopes and abortive efforts. Again and again they have failed to see or courageously to meet issues only too painfully obvious. Secret diplomacy and national pride have crept back

and frustrated our hope that the need for open dealings and the frank recognition of national interdependence had been amply and satisfactorily demonstrated.

All this and much more is true. Honesty, however, compels us to admit that it is not all the truth. There can never have been an age when so many have seen the folly and wickedness of war, when such serious efforts were being made to build up the structure of a world society, when there was so deep a distrust of purely national and chauvinistic policies. I believe that the human family is in process of learning this great lesson that no nation liveth to itself. How slow we are to learn needs no emphasis; the one question is, Has some progress been made through the bitter experiences of war and post-war tragedies? The beginnings of a world consciousness of what is and what is not permissible between nations are to be detected in the League of Nations, the minority treaties, the principle of the Mandates, the Permanent Court at The Hague, the Paris Pact, and even in the appointment of a Commission to report on Manchuria. Little enough is there of positive result: but steps have been taken, there is a gathering of opinion behind the halting and uncertain action of statesmen, leaders are subject to wide criticism if they fail to measure up to standards of international action which have but recently emerged or been generally accepted. Even in our economic relations, in spite of the huge folly of the reparations plan, wisdom is beginning to come to her own and the Lausanne Conference seems to mark a distinct step forward. Many realize that high tariff walls are, in the end, suicidal; bankers and business leaders see that trade between nations is like the flow of blood in the body, an essential of corporate health and even life itself.

To judge our meager successes by the needs of the situation or by the announced ideals of our prophets and seers is to yield to deep discouragement. But they may better be judged in the light of previous similar efforts, and against the background of suspicion and jealousy which must be overcome before peace can be firmly established between the nations. Seen thus there is solid ground for hope, even if it be a chastened hope. Men are not utterly blind to those principles of righteousness and decency, which must operate between communities as between persons. The greatest things come slowly. We sink into despair because we take short views. Men talk of crisis and extreme urgency in these matters and there is truth in what they say. But such talk may drive us into pessimism if it raises impossible expectations and leads us to apply the measuring scale of years where we should use that of generations.

#### IV

The signs that the hand of God is still guiding the great movements of the race are not wanting, as I have tried to show. But what of the Christian Church? Is it true that just at this moment she has lost her hold upon the masses, and still more upon the intellectual leaders, that she has missed her opportunity by her failure to see what is happening, by her divisions, her engrossment in secondary interests and her lack of sympathy with the great elemental needs of men? To judge thus would be in this case also to judge on the basis of selected facts rather than on that of all the facts available. Leaders of the churches and men and women who have found their inspiration in and through the churches are among the foremost in the great movements of the day. Even those who have left them very often learned in their churches the very principles which have driven them forth to express them in other fields. Divisions are many and deplorable but the steady growth of movements of co-operation and unity is at least as significant a phase of modern Christianity. All these and many other relevant data must be weighed ere we draw upon the facts of contemporary religion to nourish the pessimistic temper.

But the most eloquent proof of the vitality of the Christian forces is not to be found in such a study, important as it is. It is to be found in men and women in almost every race under heaven to whom God, as revealed in Jesus Christ, has become a transforming and dynamic Reality. I think of Aggrey of Africa, set on fire by the love of Christ and rising above all the limitations laid upon men of his race by the pride and prejudice of others, and demonstrating that there is no color bar for the children of the Kingdom. I remember K. T. Paul of India bringing the fine sensitiveness and insight of his race and showing to high and low alike what Christ can do with such material. My mind rests for a moment on the quiet, effective work of a woman in China, coming from one of her most famous families, who built up a school and maintained it against innumerable odds because she found in Christ the one hope for her people. Nor can one forget for a moment that utterly devoted and Spirit-filled leader in Japan—Toyohiko Kagawa—burning himself out in passionate service for his Lord. These and many, many thousands more are the children of the Christian churches. They tell us in many languages and through very varied personalities that this far-flung campaign of missions, begun in spite of opposition and misunderstanding, carried out against stupendous odds and often viewed with indifference even by so-called Christians, is justified. It was founded on



the belief in the universality of Jesus of Nazareth. No generation until our own has had that stupendous faith amply and convincingly demonstrated. We may have failed in many things and shown weakness in many more, but dare we be anything but optimists about the future of the religion of Jesus when we find him making fresh conquests in our generation in every race and nation?

Nor are these conquests limited to those who have enrolled themselves as members of any church. The principles of the life of Jesus of Nazareth are acknowledged as of supreme worth by multitudes who have not taken his name. Some would say that it is in spite of the churches and not because of them that Jesus is thus honored, that they have indeed hidden him and distorted the picture which had otherwise charmed and won many more. There is an element of truth in this, and every one of us who has dared to take His name knows that he has made his own contribution toward the misunderstanding of his Master. But it is, again, only half the truth. It is because the church has treasured the records of that wondrous life that we can read them to-day; it is through the experiments in Christian living that the church has stimulated that we see more of what it means to follow the Christ to-day; it is in the lives of the sons and daughters of the church who have best understood him that the world has again and again been challenged to consider him and his claims.

Viewing in perspective the story of Christianity, looking at the power of Christ in contemporary lives in many lands, and fairly estimating the vital forces at work within the church to-day, we cannot fall back into pessimism about the future of religion—and in particular of the religion which finds its central inspiration in the Person of Jesus and his interpretation of life. There are plenty of things to criticize in organized Christianity, but the strongest of critics are to be found not only outside but also within the organization. When we can criticize and love the same person or community there is a sure ground for hope. We have no need to be despondent about the church and still less about the religion of Jesus.

## V

We cannot be oblivious to the fact that we live in an age when faith and hope have ebbed. Matthew Arnold's lines are not inappropriate to-day:

"The Sea of Faith

Was, once, too, at the full, and round earth's shore

Lay like the folds of a bright girdle furled.  
But now I only hear  
Its melancholy, long, withdrawing roar,  
Retreating to the breath  
Of the night-winter, down the vast edges drear  
And naked shingles of the world."

Yet ebb tide is followed by the flood: "If winter comes can spring be far behind?" Perhaps the forces that have caused the ebb are even now gathering for the returning flow. Was it not necessary that the facile optimism of pre-war days should be utterly shattered that we might discover surer grounds of hope? These we may, I believe, find by a saner and more penetrating analysis of current events, not only those I have reviewed but others in the fields of education, literature, penal administration and so forth. Again and again in history the unobserved work of a few has proved more enduring than the much-advertised activities of the many. These silent, patient, constructive forces are at work now and in our midst and they will come, are coming, to their own.

There is, in the long last, however, but one unshakable foundation for hope, for that hope which "builds from its own wreck the thing it contemplates," which can outlast unnumbered disappointments, still drawing music from the one remaining string of the lyre. The foundation is God, not as a mere blind force and not a barren intellectual proposition; but God known in the heart of man, arousing him ever to fresh effort, assuring him that his labor is not in vain, giving him confidence that in his highest strivings he is in some true, if dimly-understood sense, a fellow laborer with God himself. For my part I cannot draw any comfort from the barren, if brave, faith that dares to do and die on the basis of a direct negation of God. Here and there men may sustain such a life. But for the deep ultimate needs of man and of society a hope based upon an affirmation of eternal values to be found in a trustworthy God seems to be essential if we are not to sink into despair for ourselves and for humanity.

## Book Reviews

**Prayer: A Study in the History and Psychology of Religion.** By FRIEDERICH HEILER. Translated and Edited by Samuel McComb, with the assistance of J. Edgar Park. New York: Oxford University Press. \$3.75.

Heiler's classic study of prayer—the only really important modern work on the subject—is now available in English. The translation by Doctor McComb and President Park is excellent and almost entirely free from Germanisms; it is not complete, but the omissions are judicious.

This masterpiece brings together richer and more varied materials about prayer than are accessible anywhere else. The prayer life of primitive man, prayer in the various developed religions, prayer in mysticism and in prophetic religion: all types are amply and freshly treated. Not the least merit of the book is its independence of a merely scientific technique; Heiler lets prayer itself speak to us, rather than the dogmas of psychoanalysis or the apparatus of questionnaires.

Yet the good qualities of this book should not blind us to the fact that it defends some doubtful opinions. There are three questions that Heiler raises in the mind of this reviewer. Has he a clear concept of the essential nature of prayer? Is he fair to philosophy? Is he fair to mysticism?

On the nature of prayer, Heiler says explicitly at the outset that "the heart of all prayer is petition." He holds to this when he criticizes "logical mysticism" for rejecting petition. But by the time he reaches the end of the book, he appears to have changed his mind. There the essence of prayer is not the "winning over of God to our side," but the "mysterious contact . . . between the finite and the infinite spirit." Prayer is communion, rather than petition.

What then has become of petition as the heart of all prayer?

Heiler is unphilosophical himself and is suspicious of the influence of philosophy on prayer. "Philosophical criticism and philosophical ideals of prayer rob it of its elemental strength." It is doubtful whether this is true; at least it is not universally true, for, while certain types of philosophical criticism destroy prayer, others interpret and support it. But if Heiler's statement be true, it raises a question about the validity of prayer which he fails to face. Should critical thought rob prayer of strength, this would happen only because thought discovers prayer to be more or less fallacious. Would Heiler have us refrain from philosophy lest we discover the dear errors on which our prayers are built?

Like Ritschl and Herrmann, Heiler attacks mysticism, meaning by mysticism its most extreme types. Yet there is a fundamental unfairness in his attitude, for he defines mysticism as "that form of intercourse with God in which the world and self are absolutely denied, in which human personality is dissolved, disappears, and is absorbed in the infinite unity of the Godhead." Having thus identified mysticism with its worst form, he grants that actual mysticism has seldom "been carried out to its strict logical consequences." Nevertheless, it is the definition rather than actual mysticism that he makes normative. He calls mysticism feminine, nonsocial, a denial of the impulse to life, ignoring Paul, the Bhagavadgītā, and Fox. That he is fascinated by the theme is indicated by his devoting a hundred pages to it, while he treats the (to him superior) prophetic religion in less than sixty pages. But his essentially moralistic conception of religion unfits him for a full appreciation of the spirit of mysticism.

Heiler's book challenges comparison

with James's *Varieties of Religious Experience*. It is less brilliant, less original, and less wide in its scope than the *Varieties*; but it is more thorough, more concentrated, and more spiritual. It is a book that every religious leader should own and study.

EDGAR SHEFFIELD BRIGHTMAN.

Boston University,  
Boston, Mass.

**The Christian Ideal and Social Control.** By BISHOP FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL. The Barrows Lectures 1930-1931. The University of Chicago Press. \$1.75.

In the 170 pages of this small volume Bishop McConnell has compressed for his Indian hearers and readers the social philosophy with which his many friends and admirers in this country have become familiar. Two men, not always congenial, or even compatible with each other, have long found their home within his capacious personality: the thinker, interested in ultimate questions for their own sake and alert to the latest currents of contemporary thought, and the practical man of affairs, piercing his way with unerring instinct to the heart of a situation and dealing with it effectively as it deserves.

In this book it is the thinker who is most in evidence. These lectures on the Christian ideal and social control, so far as local color is concerned, might as well have been given in any other country as in India. They deal with the homely wisdom for which we are accustomed to look from the author, with such themes as human value, the problem of the given, institutional conversion, and social cross-bearing. A final chapter pays its respects to humanism and gives reason for believing that the dynamic humanism needs for its effective functioning can come only, or at least best, from belief in God.

Of the six lectures, readers of the

Bishop's earlier books will find the fifth, on Social Cross-Bearing, most original and rewarding. Here he reminds us of the discouraging fact that "the upholders of the Christian social ideal have not always paid as much attention to the method of giving that ideal a start and foothold in the world as they have to the aim itself" (page 117). But the characteristic thing about Christianity is just this, that it brings a new method, the method of the Cross; and this method has social as well as individual implications.

For one whose life has been as rich as the author's in fruitful experiences, the book is singularly lacking in illustration. This gives the whole a somewhat academic and detached flavor which does not do full justice to the Bishop's thought. One could have wished that out of his experience in dealing with questions of race or class in our own country he could have drawn illustrations applicable to the new and difficult situation in which India finds herself. One could wish even more that he could have used in further illustration some of the problems which modern India presents.

It is not difficult for one who has recently been in India to understand why he has not done the last of these. No one whose fortune it has been, like the present reviewer, to touch at first hand the problems of present-day India can be surprised that a man as wise as Bishop McConnell should have felt constrained to observe in this regard an almost complete reticence.

WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN.

Union Theological Seminary,  
New York City.

**A Preface to Christian Faith in a New Age.** By RUFUS M. JONES. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$2.00.

As the reader takes up this new book by the beloved Sage of Haverford, he

will find the publisher's announcement on the flap of the jacket. He will con the list of a dozen names of "leaders of thought in the religious world," from the head of a great theological institution to the brilliant young departmental associate of the author, who were the Quaker philosopher's colleagues in planning and producing this "Preface." If at this point the reader is clamped into non-critical receptivity by the weight of endorsing authority, he may sharpen his appetite for the feast by scanning first the author's Foreword and then his Epilogue.

Doctor Jones explains his method of seeking advice and criticism from leaders, while assuming sole responsibility for both conclusions and expressions. He also discloses the whole ambitious scheme of interpretation which is contemplated. It is the purpose of the author with his twelve counsellors and thirty-three directors to go forward with the project of applying Christ's way of life to the tasks which confront the world to-day. He professes "an unconquered faith in the coming expansion of Christian life and truth, and in the revitalization of human society." The new life and power will come through "recovery of fresh insight, reception of spiritual energies, and the practice of self-giving love, rather than by the proclamation of abstract notions and finely constructed theories." He looks for a salvation in which the saved will acquire "a dynamic by which to live, a love marked by increase of richness and purity, the conquest of the lower nature, steadiness and patience in the midst of adversity and frustration, consecration and loyalty which delights to struggle for the lives of others." Such a life is adaptable to either an earthly or a heavenly sphere.

The author does not claim finality for the work. At the most it is still "A Preface." He believes that if statesmen and bankers of all countries are justified

in taking up the study of the world situation in finance, industry and trade, and in coming together to consult; then leaders of thought and experts in the way of life are right in showing a like concern to evaluate the spiritual assets of the race and to stress those realities which cannot be shaken. We must, the author thinks, rediscover the stabilizing power of a great faith. Hence is needed not only the co-operative effort of a select Council, but also of all those who have "wisdom and experience and vision and insight." At this point the humble reader comes into his own, finding a challenge and a chance to contribute to the Christian faith in a new age. The chapters include the following: Obstacles and Hindrances, Re-examination of Spiritual Foundations, Testimony of Human Experience, The Heart of Christianity, Nature and Mission of the Church, New Emphasis in Education.

LEON K. WILLMAN.

Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

**The Christian Faith.** By JOSEPH STUMP. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$4.00.

In reading this book one is impressed with its formal neatness, its clarity of style, its precision of statement, its compactness and its systematic arrangement. In these respects it is a model textbook. Its definitions and expositions are remarkably simple, clear, and accurate. One could hardly find a better introduction to traditional Protestant theology.

One is, however, rather surprised at the degree to which the author carries his conservatism. This is perhaps due in part to his expressed purpose "to present the doctrines of the Lutheran Church on the basis of the Holy Scriptures and in consonance with her confessions." But there is no indication of any conflict between his own views and those of the church to which he belongs. Nor



does he seem to allow in the Lutheran Church of to-day any significant departure from the earlier standards. After enumerating the Lutheran Confessions such as the Augsburg Confession, Luther's Small and Large Catechisms, and the Formula of Concord he declares that "bona-fide subscription to these Confessions is required of Lutheran ministers" and that if any minister refuses to subscribe to them "he thereby testifies that he is not in harmony with the doctrinal position of the Lutheran Church, and has no right to preach in her name."

In harmony with this strict confessionalism the author speaks of the Bible as "infallible" and "inerrant," holding that its inspiration "is in the right sense of the term verbal." Its account of creation is "a divinely inspired record of fact," though it "leaves us free to believe either that the days were periods of twenty-four hours or of millions of years." The doctrine of the original integrity of man and of a subsequent fall into sin is of "fundamental" importance and so also is the doctrine of the Virgin Birth. "The vicarious atonement is the clear teaching of Holy Scripture, and therefore to be accepted on its authority." A similar view is taken of the literal second coming of Christ. In dealing with the Trinity Doctor Stump denies personality in "the modern psychological sense" of the term to the three "persons," saying that "self-consciousness and self-determination" are to be predicated of "the one divine essence." But in discussing the person of Christ he declares that his personality was constituted by the person or ego of the Logos; and surely the personality of Jesus involved self-consciousness and self-determination. At this point there would, therefore, seem to be a serious inconsistency between the author's doctrine of the Trinity and his Christology. The inconsistency, however, is inherent in the traditional theology and is to be

ascribed to it rather than to Doctor Stump himself.

One wonders whether the young ministers in the Northwestern Lutheran Theological Seminary, of which Doctor Stump is president, will find this type of theology adequate to their intellectual needs and to the needs of their congregations. It would seem that the science and the culture of our day would require a more critical attitude toward the creeds of the past, and especially so in a great historic church like that of Lutheranism with a highly trained ministry. It is rather strange that while abroad the Lutheran Church has been the home of theological freedom and progress, it has in this country been on the whole so conservative and strictly confessional.

But conservative as the book is, it has a very distinct value as an exposition of the Protestant theology of the past, and as such is to be highly recommended. I should advise every student of theology to read and study it as a background for a more modernistic interpretation of the Christian faith.

ALBERT C. KNUDSON.

Boston University School of Theology,  
Boston, Mass.

### Unfashionable Convictions.

By BERNARD IDDINGS BELL. New York: Harper & Brothers. \$2.00.

President Bernard Iddings Bell is a brilliant minor prophet. His writing is always clever, sincere and scintillating, but his burden of thought is not major prophecy, contributing something new and lasting for all time. The present volume, *Unfashionable Convictions*, he himself frankly states, is composed of comment on true convictions he holds, but the flashing (never "flashy") essays "are not articulated into an expression of (his) unified and unifying faith." Even for him this is not a *magnum opus*. But

it is far enough beyond pot-boiling casualness to be noteworthy, nevertheless. What Doctor Bell writes even incidentally is worth reading attentively.

Of course he does not accept the dictum that the *vox populi* is *vox dei*. He proclaims himself a nonconformist against the mass-mindedness of a decade when he feels the whole populace "has broken loose from simple and age-tested wisdoms." "Never before," he maintains, "has a mob grown modernist." Against flagrant heresies he lifts his voice, feeling himself, like Elijah, only remaining true. He announces convictions he asserts are unfashionable. He believes almost no one shares them with him in this Mencknite era.

Now it is no function of a reviewer to debate the theme of the book he reviews. There is no rightness in using the material thus provided as a mere spring-board for the reviewer's own convictions. Nevertheless the question may well be raised if President Bell quite does us justice who think ourselves of a fairly substantial backbone group in a society we feel is, except for the vapid and vocal surface minority clique of the smart-to-be-tough sophisticates, reasonably unanimous on most of the convictions the author enunciates.

For instance, how alien to the silent, steady majority are these convictions?

1. "I am convinced, current fashion to the contrary notwithstanding, that religion is a discipline to be followed by him who would come at truth."

2. "I am convinced that happiness, as popularly defined, is a poor sort of thing for which to live."

3. "I am convinced that the saints, whose ways are well-nigh forgotten, had a wisdom we have not, albeit not an easy one."

4. "I am convinced that, because God loves each human being, the present tendency to make of men and women mere tools in productiveness of wealth is anti-Christ."

5. "I am convinced that tolerance—which is to-day admired as though it were the same thing as the greatest of virtues, charity—is frequently an evidence of enervated personality."

6. I am convinced that what passes for patriotism among us is for the most part spurious coinage."

When the author speaks on education he may voice opinions which are not yet so much convictions as they are suspicions to the layman. But even the non-collegiate side-liner is sometimes found wondering whether college is producing "those who can do intellectual work of reasonable maturity and competence." The separation of religion from education leaves the university unable (or unwilling) to teach universals which are ultimately religious. The trend of secondary schools to stress requirements less and less and to follow either non-cultural utilitarianism or line-of-least-resistance kindergartenized play-methods alarms the old-fashioned who still believe there are some categorical imperatives to learning. Such a reader will nod his head satisfiedly over many a page of these chapters.

There are many among the silent majority who will be glad that Doctor Bell has expressed for them their squeamish discomfort over what passes for patriotism, particularly when politics are pushed. The premium placed on conformity makes "our patriotism at once too petty and too monstrous—too large and overgrown for the welfare of the sacred individual; too small to allow our leadership in the substitution of world co-operation for economic and military wars." Such statements are worth mental Fletcherizing.

The religious point of view in the book is exactly that of a liberal Catholic Anglican. (There is such a combination.) President Bell is a mystic, he values the sacraments at their maximum, he believes that the church is a means to direct experience of God, but that if

it fails to produce this it must be taught that "dogmas and rituals are the vesture of religion," only valid in proportion to their fitness for man's heart and mind, that it exists for "systematic self-reminding" of those who are "willing to pay the price of disciplined devotion."

Altogether a worth-while but not epochal book, brilliant with almost Chestertonian thrusts, but not anywhere near as much the expression of a defensive minority as the author assumes. It is a praising appraisal which differs from the assumption of the unfashionableness of these convictions by the claim that they are much more widely held than shouted from the housetops. They may not be "fashionable" in the smart and sophisticated group, but in the solid majority group which is the backbone of society they are widely shared, no matter how vaguely. President Bell has done us a real service to crystallize them in such pungent utterance.

PHILLIPS E. OSGOOD.

Minneapolis, Minn.

**The Varieties of Present-Day Preaching.** Edited by G. BROMLEY OXNAM. New York: The Abingdon Press. \$2.00.

This book gives us the lectures delivered at the Fourth Conference on Preaching at the Boston School of Theology in October, 1931. This annual conference is rapidly growing in importance and influence, bringing together as it does each year a group of the most able and forceful preachers of our nation.

This last conference dealt with the Varieties of Present-Day Preaching. Twelve men (Stidger, Brown, Hough, Speer, Silver, Holmes, Hewitt, Leonard, Mitchell, Adams, Shannon, Krumbine), each one of whom is showing marked

force in dealing with a distinct type of congregation, addressed the conference. Each frankly discloses the method, the motive, and the message of his preaching. This book makes these self-revelations available in what should prove to be a text on homiletics worthy to be placed alongside the best previous texts.

These lectures are timely, challenging, prophetic. They display a variety in the preacher's opportunity and method but a striking unity of expression as to his call, mood, emphasis, and passion. Each lecture is a call for reality, a demand for action, a cry for "thought, not thoughts," an appeal for a sense of "the mighty ordination of the pierced hands," out of which a universal socially redeeming message will flame to all sorts and conditions of men.

This volume is valuable also as showing the trend of the best of present-day preaching. That preaching is not concerned with creeds, though it knows their value. It is not concerned with social, economic and political programs, though it is familiar with them. It is not concerned with forms and symbols, though it is expert in their use. It is not unmindful of the immediate and desperate circumstances of life, though its chief concern is with "the things that count and count *eternally*." It knows that "there may be other inducements for skillful living, eternity is the only safe incentive for right living." It addresses itself, therefore, to the themes that "are not for an age nor for a time" and that touch life in its larger, deeper phases, whether it be the life that gathers in the college chapel, the cathedral, in the metropolis, or in the church by the crossroads.

I recommend this book to preachers. It will drive them to their knees, but it will also afford them helps to finer skills in preaching. I recommend it to laymen. Undoubtedly they will find in its high ideals and examples of "truth through personality" a basis for renewed

confidence in the church which produces and gives place to these prophets of a timeless faith.

THOMAS W. GRAHAM.

The Graduate School of Theology,  
Oberlin, Ohio,

**Issues of Immortality.** A Study in Implications. By CORLISS LAMONT. New York: Henry Holt & Co. \$1.50.

In form and matter—to speak in Aristotelian terms—this book is modern. Understand this as meaning contemporary, not in any sense futuristic.

Doctor Lamont's aim is to trace the implications of certain ideas of immortality in view of "the issue of Platonism versus Aristotelianism in psychology and metaphysics" (p. 8). Wishing not to misrepresent other writers, he quotes them so extensively that in the book of 198 pages, including bibliography, there are 369 notes, almost all of which are references. But the quotations are well-chosen and are not allowed to obscure the argument. After a brief survey of historic conceptions of a future life, the author turns to ideas now current and finds a dilemma in the choice between making the hereafter emotionally desirable and holding to what is intellectually acceptable. Then following for the most part Santayana, who follows Spinoza, who follows Aristotle, Doctor Lamont concludes that if logic rules out theories of personal survival after death, the modern mind may take refuge in some other view, notably social or ideal immortality, though these, "by their very nature, preclude attainment except by the cream of intellect and character and achievement" (p. 176).

With timely wisdom the author holds that the subject of immortality needs critical philosophical treatment; but he counts this book as only an introductory

study. While his modesty and evident desire for fairness are winning, the confidence with which he builds upon unproved philosophical presuppositions is to be deplored. He seems to take for granted a realistic theory, such as Santayana's. One may heartily accept the Aristotelian view that the self must be embodied, and yet find most consistent therewith a dynamic conception of the body as expressing the activities of the self. Doctor Lamont's treatment of value would call for serious criticism, had this review no limitations.

GEORGE A. WILSON.

Syracuse University,  
Syracuse, N. Y.

**Paul the Sower.** By ALLAN REGINALD BROWN. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. \$1.25.

*Paul the Sower*, by Allan Reginald Brown, is a unique book. It is first of all unique in its authorship, for it is very rare that a layman, a practising lawyer at that, has either the time or the inclination to make such a thorough study of the sources and background of Paul's writings. *Paul the Sower* is really a study of the Epistle to the Romans, but the approach to it involves a study of the Hebrew and Greek influences which were a part of Paul's heritage and training.

Mr. Brown claims that he has never seen a satisfactory outline of the Book of the Romans, for the reason that the modern scholar who approaches the study does so with the preconceived idea that any treatise of the kind must necessarily follow a logical development, with an introduction, a body and a conclusion. This is not true of Paul's letter to the Romans, the author claims, and he certainly seems to substantiate his statement. We must keep in mind what Paul was trying to do. He was not trying to describe an experience, but to convey

that experience to others and to make it grow. So obsessed is he with this thought that it never occurs to him to write a logical treatise. Every suggestion springs directly from the central thought and has immediate relation to that thought. The author compares the structure of the letter to a wheel, the spokes of which have no direct relation to each other, but each of which is directly connected with the hub. "It is conceived in simultaneity, not succession." That hub is "the double statement, the fact of sin and the way out" and "everything in the epistle is in amplification or illustration of one half or the other of that double statement."

To illustrate his conception of the structure of the epistle the author uses three diagrams, which at first appear to be fanciful, but a careful study of which clarifies and illuminates the whole discussion.

Much of the difficulty that leads men astray in their understanding of Paul arises from a mistranslation. To illustrate this the author enters upon a discussion of five words: Redemption, Adoption, Justification, Reconciliation, and Forgiveness. The misunderstanding of these words came from the fact that the early translators "made the mistake of going to literary rather than vernacular sources for the meaning of Paul's words." He shows that Paul constantly has in mind that man is a slave to sin, and so the real meaning of "redemption" is "emancipation."

There is not space here to go further into the method used. The book looks at the Epistle to the Romans from a new angle and is both stimulating and illuminating. I can heartily recommend it as a most helpful study to a better understanding of what Paul had in mind when he wrote his letter to the group of Christians in Rome.

JOHN GOWDY.

Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal  
Church, Foochow, China.

[ 632 ]

## Romances from the Old Testament.

By DALLAS LORE SHARP. New  
York: The Abingdon Press. \$1.50.

THE death of Dallas Lore Sharp in 1929 was a severe loss to the field of scientific study, wholesome appreciation of nature and life, and happy literary expression. I remember him well from our days in Brown University together. Even then he had the scientific insight, the healthful reaction to life and its meaning, and could command the language needful to give to others what he had found and understood.

Such a personality was naturally concerned with religion and would suitably turn to the Bible as a pre-eminent expression of religious life. Thus the volume now at hand, fortunately issued under the direction of Mrs. Sharp, is a natural outcome of the thinking of her husband, and all interested in good reading are placed under real obligation to him and to her.

This may be seen as soon as one turns to the pages of the book. Here are found fresh interpretations of thirteen Old Testament characters with side lights upon those associated with them—Hagar, Rebekah, Joseph, Rahab, Jephthah, Samson, Abigail, David and Jonathan, the Maid of Shunem, Athaliah, Queen Esther, Ruth, and those with whom their lives were entwined. Accordingly the volume is both less than history and more than history; it is a happy reconstruction of Old Testament life and Israelitish activities. The Old Testament really cannot be understood without approaching it as in some sense a series of romances. Dallas Lore Sharp could see that romantic life in a remarkable wholesome manner, and those who desire to understand the background of Israelitish literature cannot afford to overlook this delightful volume.

FRANK GRANT LEWIS.

Crozer Theological Seminary,  
Chester, Pennsylvania.



**Building a Girl's Personality.** By RUTH SHONLE CAVAN and JORDAN TRUE CAVAN. New York: The Abingdon Press. \$1.50.

This excellent little volume deals with the problems and adjustments of the girl who is attempting to navigate the seas of college or a job where she must chart her course, keep her head, and be sure of her port in this modern and difficult weather of social change. Some of the problems here considered are the girl and her family; the mother-daughter relationship; the development of emotional self-dependence; the balance of interest between marriage and a job; the place of a social agency like the church in providing opportunities for friendship with men; emotional unbalances such as indifference, super-sensitiveness, inferiority feelings, and day-dreams; and the place of religion in developing an adequate philosophy of life.

The book is unacademic in its dealing with these complicated, psychological problems and at the same time has its foundation set firmly in the rock of attested research. It is admirable in its use of well-summarized case materials which in a large number of instances have been collected by the authors themselves.

While psychological insights and sociological implications of many kinds are suggested to the reader, he will feel particularly grateful for the play of light upon the varied emotional adjustments of the young girl. The traditional preoccupation of the teacher and of the religious educationalist (and, indeed, in many cases of the parent) with the *intellectual* maturing of the youth has often been accompanied by a very great under-estimation of the importance of emotional development. As to the forces and factors involved in that development, the ignorance of much of our best leadership is still abysmal. It is the psychiatrists and social psychologists who

are exploring this *terra incognita*. In this volume, many of the fruits of this research are presented in every-day language and made usable for those who are dealing with individual girls or building programs for groups.

The excellent reference material, together with a few thought-provoking questions listed at the end of each chapter make the book particularly good for discussion in any group of leaders who have responsibility in setting the stage for a girl's achievement of adulthood.

TWILA LYTTON CAVERT.

Bronxville,  
New York City.

**Pastoral Psychiatry and Mental Health.** By JOHN RATHBONE OLIVER, D.D., M.D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$2.75.

This title is intriguing to pastors and social workers in this day when the psychic states are such popular topics, and when the vagaries and potentialities of psychiatry are bringing new revelations to thinkers and workers in human welfare. While we are waiting for psychology and eugenics to produce the superman and to lift the clouds hovering over many darkened and restricted lives, there is ample field for the practical social worker, equipped with knowledge of the perversions of the human mind, to bring relief to the sufferers in his parish. Often the pastor gets into the family social problems, which may have underlying psychic causes, in a way that the family physician does not.

This book undertakes to describe and to illustrate mental illnesses and maladjustments, and to bring to the uninitiated a knowledge of the caprices of the disordered human mind. Clinical material from hypothetical and actual cases is freely used to put the meaning of psychic pathology into the human terms of everyday life. The depressive states, schizophrenia, paranoia, epilepsy, paresis,

and mental deficiencies become realities instead of vague terms. The author also devotes two chapters to the sexual factors in mental maladjustments. Here the terms autoerotism, heteroerotism, homoerotism, masochism, sadism, and the like receive their clarification at the hands of an author whose fondness for linguistics finds a lucrative etymological field.

Doctor Oliver, as ordained priest and graduate physician, has an unusual background and, one would think, a rare opportunity to produce a helpful, practical book on pastoral psychiatry. We confess, however, to a sense of disappointment. Much of the subject-matter is devoted to types of mental disease that lie outside the realm of pastors and social workers. They are infrequently met with and they are very difficult for even trained psychiatrists to handle. It may be interesting for the priest to know what paranoia, schizophrenia, and paresis are but a practical textbook in pastoral psychiatry might well give less space to these relatively hopeless states, and rather find generous room for the more common neurasthenic and hysterical conditions that every pastor frequently meets. This erudite and skillful writer seems to us to have produced a book which suffers from its author's erudition; hence the selection of the more unusual types. Yet his style is popular and attractive.

Protestant pastors, who might hail the title of this book as introducing a *vade mecum* for their work in human relations, may be annoyed at the reiterations of Catholic superiority and at the frequent allusions to the technique of using the Mass, Confirmation, Confessional and the functions of the Catholic priest to relieve the psychic states which he describes. Nearly all references to church and church workers are put into Catholic terminology. Particularly Methodists may not enjoy the author's lapse of good taste in suggesting as a

test for paresis the pronunciation of "Methodist Episcopal." Surely a more appropriate tongue-twister could have been found.

In his closing chapter the author gives free vent to his devout religious spirit. It is helpful, indeed, to read his plea for more time for God and the spiritual life. This genuine religious spirit pervades the book. The author is apparently a mystic and a Catholic Episcopalian. This, perhaps, explains in part his conservatism on the subject of birth control and his implied belief in demoniacal possession.

This book will be a useful addition to the pastor's library. The material of it was originally delivered as the 1932 Hale lectures at Western Theological Seminary, Evanston.

J. G. VAUGHAN, M.D.

Medical Advisor, Board of Foreign Missions, Methodist Episcopal Church.

New York, N. Y.

**The Causes of War.** Edited by ARTHUR PORRITT. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$1.50.

**Boycotts and Peace.** Edited by EVANS CLARK. Report of the Committee on Economic Sanctions, President Nicholas Murray Butler, Chairman. New York: Harper and Brothers. \$4.

WHAT are the causes of war? They are, in fact, many. They not infrequently overlap and conspire together to make resort to arms probable if not inevitable. Diagnosing the causes of war is therefore a profitable and necessary pursuit on the part of those who would create a warless world.

In this volume a group of eminent international authorities seek to probe the conditions and circumstances out of which wars emerge. The discussions constitute the findings of Commission No. 1 of the World Conference for

International Peace Through Religion. The question put before this Commission was, "What are the causes of war and the tendencies that make for war?" The following were set down as descriptive of the major causes of military conflict: economic, racial, press and propaganda, industrial, and political. Religion was not held by the members of the Commission to be a basic contributory cause of international dissension, the conclusion being that "at this stage of the world's history, the natural rôle of the forces of religion is to assist the cause of peace, not to threaten it."

It would be impossible within the compass of this review to appraise the conclusions reached by the men whose views are set forth in this book. It should be enough to say that each writer has treated his subject not only in an interesting but also in a masterful and convincing manner.

Sir Arthur Salter, internationally known economist, is convinced that the characteristic form of the present and probable economic conflicts is not to be found in attempts to acquire new territory, but is to be found in the use of the power of government to deflect the course of trade between one country and another.

C. F. Andrews, commenting on the racial causes of war, is of the opinion that the future of the human race is likely still further to witness congestion of population, which fact makes necessary the preaching and practicing of good will in dealing with the idiosyncrasies of various peoples.

With respect to religion and war, Dr. Henry A. Atkinson, Secretary of the Church Peace Union, raises the question, "Can religion, that plays such an important part in human life, be made as strong a factor for peace as it has been for war?"

Commenting on the function of the press in ridding the world of war, Frederick J. Libby, Secretary of the National

Council for Prevention of War, says, "The real question is how can news of a military nature, inevitable and legitimate so long as the war machine exists, be offset by news which will tend to create the newer picture of a world organized on a peace basis."

Wickham Steed, English publicist, in the final chapter analyzes the function to be performed by international law in the development of a pacific universe.

Is the Kellogg Pact a "toothless" document? This question has been answered one way and another by the international experts. A group of prominent economists, lawyers, and educators, headed by President Nicholas Murray Butler, of Columbia University, has made an intensive study of the problem of economic sanctions, and the findings of this group are contained in this important volume. It is a very valuable contribution to the peace worker's library.

In brief, the Committee proposes: an amendment to the Pact of Paris through which all the signatory nations would pledge themselves in the event of hostilities in violation of the Pact, or the threat of such hostilities, promptly to consult together to determine upon such joint measures of non-intercourse against the offending nation as would be appropriate to keep the peace; and that the government of the United States, as co-initiator of the Pact at once take the lead in calling a conference of representatives of the signatories for the specific purpose of effecting such an amendment.

Among the measures of non-intercourse which the Committee suggests as a means of strengthening the Kellogg Pact and which are analyzed in this volume are:

1. A cessation of any shipment of arms or munitions or other absolute contraband, and
2. Such further economic sanctions

and concerted measures, short of the use of force, as may be determined to be appropriate and practical under the circumstances of any given case.

The several contributors discuss at length the pros and cons of the sanctions question. They advise against the policy of an independently-initiated economic boycott, but they are in agreement regarding the value of a modified form of sanctions, internationally instituted and carried forward without the use of the military.

WALTER W. VAN KIRK.

Secretary, Committee on International Justice and Good Will, Federal Council of Churches.  
New York City.

### The New Crisis in the Far East.

By STANLEY HIGH. New York:  
Fleming H. Revell & Co. \$1.00.

A man lays himself open to charges of favoritism when he unequivocally recommends a book written by a long-time friend. Nevertheless, and thus defying the critical lightning, I hereby state that Stanley High has produced a most readable introduction to present-day international complications in the Far East and, at the same time, one which is accurate and impartial.

True, it is written in "journalese," but what of that? An occasional solecism creeps in, two or three mistakes in spelling or organization of sentences; but, again, what of it? The facts are well marshaled. Vividness and concreteness are characteristics of the vari-

ous chapters. The very fact that this book possesses the quality of being easily read may prove a handicap to it in scholarly circles, but for the man or woman who has neither time nor inclination for long and usually ponderous textbooks, this book is heartily commended.

The thesis of the book is expressed in a judgment on the military and naval operations of Japan and China in late 1931. Mr. High writes, "Anybody's war, we knew, was likely to become our war, and nobody's peace was safe while anybody's peace was disturbed." As he discusses the fears, suspicions, interrelations of China, Russia and Japan, the recurring *motif* is that a world is being made unsafe for civilized beings by uncivilized emotions and actions in any section of that world.

The book is *not* recommended as a missionary textbook; I should despise a missionary passion built upon fear for my own land. The book is not offered as a missionary textbook, but in it are to be found more than passing plaudits for the accomplishments of the Christian missionaries. And it appears clear to the author—as it appears also to this reviewer—that there is a spiritual battle now in progress among missionaries—those of Marx and Mars and the Prince of Peace.

FRANK T. CARTWRIGHT.

Associate Secretary for China, Japan, and Korea, Board of Foreign Missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church,  
New York, N. Y.

## Bookish Brevities

DR. ALBERT SCHWEITZER, about whom John Dickinson Regester has written informedly in his book *The Man and His Work*, has recently concluded a month of Bach recitals in Great Britain. While in Norwich he spent an evening with Mr. C. F. Andrews. Imagination delights to intrude and to linger upon the scene. Their conversation consisted chiefly of a discussion of Indian philosophy. Doctor Schweitzer is writing a three-volume "Philosophy." In his spiritual autobiography, *What I Owe to Christ*, "Christ's Friendly Apostle" refers with abiding gratitude to the beneficent place of Schweitzer upon his life.

W. D. Schermerhorn, of Garrett Biblical Institute, is one of three Church Historians who as a Commission have traveled the world around in the interest of missionary understanding. Their enquiry was sponsored by the American Society of Church History and by the International Missionary Council. Despite the depression and disturbance which they found everywhere, such auspices afforded them opportunity for information accessible to few even in the most favored times. They endeavored to secure the preservation of the records of the beginnings of Christianity in the newer churches and to promote the training of native church leaders in Christian history. For several years Professor Schermerhorn has devoted a major portion of his time to the preparation of a *History of Christian Missions* and it is understood that his material has been much enriched by this exceptional experience.

To Dr. H. Maldwyn Hughes, author of *Basic Beliefs* and several other books, has come the honor of being the last President of the Wesleyan Conference of Great Britain. Doctor Hughes has the rare combination of genuine scholar-

ship, administrative sagacity and a winsome modesty. When to him were handed the keys which are the symbol of his office and the Bible which, starting from John Wesley, has been passed down to every Conference President, his response was, "I am proud to have these keys which open nothing and the Book which opens everything."

Many exponents of religious education are unhappy. Scores of students who have painstakingly prepared themselves for usefulness are denied opportunities for service. They are assailed by a wide disappointment in the results of improved educational methods. There is little diminution of belief in the potentialities of education, but there is an impatience to see them more productive in the lives of those thus taught. Educational leaders reply that a sufficient number of church workers have never been willing to take the trouble to equip themselves to use the better teaching materials which have been provided nor has the church ever become willing to furnish the financial support for a system of religious education strong enough to overcome the deleterious environment from which children derive their dominant ideas and attitudes. Doctors Betts, Bower, Hartshorne, Weigle, Veith and other enlightened leaders are earnestly endeavoring to transform the dissatisfaction into a stimulation to the use of more effective educational techniques.

In numerous ministerial libraries, for nearly a score of years, the little volume *The Necessity of Christ*, by W. E. Orchard, has been singularly treasured. In their travels discerning clergymen have sought out Kings Weigh Chapel, London, some to follow Doctor Orchard in an ornate liturgy, more to listen to his prophetic preaching. They who were



privileged to be his guest over a cup of tea have talked of his attractive personality and of his detached life. The few who have known him best believe that a sensitiveness born of loneliness caused him to feel that he was misunderstood and impelled him to seek the fellowship of Roman Catholicism. No one questions the sincerity of his earnestness to do the will of God. Dr. John Hutton has made a characteristically brilliant comment upon his submission to the Tiber by quoting from an old slab which was fished out of the Straits of Eubea—

"A shipwrecked seaman buried on this coast

Bids you set sail!

Full many a gallant barque when we were lost

Weathered the gale!"

Dr. Lynn Harold Hough has occupied two of the most famous trans-Atlantic pulpits this past summer: Wellington Street, Glasgow and City Temple, London.

*The City Temple Tidings* publishes this comment upon his eighth visit as vacation preacher: "Certainly no preacher from overseas evokes a greater warmth of welcome or makes a stronger appeal to our congregations. Doctor Hough is a master alike of the science and the art of preaching. Breadth of conception, penetrating discernment, deep understanding of life, are all made vivid and vital by a fine energy of speech which is like a deep-flowing river, now and then driven forward in an irresistible cataract of noble utterance."

The London papers publish Doctor Hough's excellent sermon on "Making Our Ancestors Our Contemporaries," a discourse which finely illustrates the application of the principles elucidated by the author in his volume *The Artist and the Critic*.

The death of Mr. Harold Copping, the famous Bible illustrator, again illus-

trates the mystery of near genius. Pedantic painters affected to patronize him, but his pictures continue to circulate in immense numbers. Fifty thousand copies of "The Hope of the World" are printed annually. His Bible pictures excel in the charm of their background, the grace with which the figures are grouped and the accuracy of detail. Thus he interpreted to the satisfaction of average people the eternal appeal of the Gospel.

Similar patronage is often extended to the popular author—Dr. F. W. Boreham. The appearance of his latest book, *A Witch's Brewing*, brought forth several manuscripts about which various publishers have been told "This should be as acceptable as the writings of Boreham." It is reported that several distinguished clergymen were a bit ill at ease when a civic reception was tendered Doctor Boreham by the Lord Mayor of Sydney, Australia. They could not recall when a civic reception had been given for a cleric and now the recipient was notably unpretentious. His ability to illuminate truth by nature and science, his assurance that the spiritual will yet prevail over the material to the well-being of mankind, his picturesqueness of phrase and his lucidity and concision of style make him a favorite with a loyal multitude of readers.

No other business receives as much gratuitous advice as the publishing. That may be because publishers are semi-professional and semi-commercial. Standard publishers are all eager to issue the best books obtainable, but it is all too evident that the buying public for quality books is deplorably limited and it is not easy to discover where these buyers are and how they may be reached. Hence, especially in a depression when books are mistaken to be luxuries, publishers are constrained to be aggressive in promotion. For, as America's humorous and

homely philosopher has remarked, "We are living in a day of urge when we do nothing until somebody shoves us. You can have Calvin Coolidge wrestling Charlie Chaplin," continues Will Rogers, "but somebody has got to sand-bag the crowd to get it to pay real money to see the match."

A salutary effect of the economic depression has been the incitement to more adequate preparation for one's life activity. Dean Hawkes, of Columbia, has defined a library as "knowledge made accessible" and the libraries are crowded as never before. What a responsibility such a situation places upon librarians for a guidance in reading which will enrich experience.

Librarians and booksellers assert that as a class the ministry is little represented in this new diligence. Yet the most numerous denomination in Protestantism has recently legislated to facilitate the elimination of unacceptable ministers. Some have suggested that now that there are more well trained candidates for the ministry than can be placed, the remedy is rather to be sought in a stricter selection for admission. Obviously, however, it is not until the admittance is past that some disclose the disposition to be deficient in industry so long as they are guaranteed a support which may be increased to some comfort by the self-taxation of fellow preachers. Studiousness is not the sole qualification for a successful ministry, but indispensably it is one.

Professor Walter B. Pitkin, of the School of Journalism of Columbia University, opines that the reading of books and magazines has steadily declined since 1922. How can such an opinion be more than a conjecture? Certainly until the financial stringency the production of books had mounted with amazing constancy. It would seem that this increase will be sustained by the ex-

tension of education when normal buying power returns. And it is presumable that there is a relation between the sale and the use of books. The best seller is not the ephemeral novel of the season, but the standard school books or the classic that sells through decade after decade.

Admittedly new obstacles to reading have appeared, as for instance the pre-attention to the radio and the moving picture. American Radio Corporations have never approached the long-visioned policy of the British Broadcasting Corporation. Mr. J. H. Whitley, Chairman of the Governors of that corporation, has recently issued this advice: "Do not listen in too much. Listening that is done at the expense of reading is not a benefit. We send out some fourteen hours of broadcasting each week-day, but I should not advise any individual to listen for more than two hours a day. The people who are twiddling all day to find what noise they can get from the far ends of the earth have not begun to learn how to use their wireless sets. Make listening and reading partners, and then you will get the best value out of both."

They who, four years ago, wrote books which described the new era of well-to-do-ness for everyone are succeeded by amateur economists with a flair for the pen. Easily they portray the causes of the depression and outline several procedures for economic elevation. They eclipse the trained economists who are governed by historical perspectives and laborious accumulations of facts. Such economists are cautious and uncertain. They do assert that we have come through such storms before and will again. They are not slow to state, however, that there are elements in this situation which portend radical transitions. Our technical knowledge and industrial skill have far outrun the character which can refrain from misusing them for

selfish acquisition. People must be trained to an improving use of more leisure and more money since we have developed machinery which makes as much labor unnecessary and which produces distributable wealth enough to permit the larger purchases essential to keep industry moving. Meanwhile makers of public opinion are in serious need of sanity lest they lend their influence to the flighty. What can I do, what am I willing to do to assist social progress, are pertinent testing questions for persons of conscience.

Analyses of American life by "disillusioned optimists" are depressing in their abundance. Correspondents ask for books that evince a fair appreciation of the opportunities of American life without yielding to a paralyzing complacency.

Consider *The Soul of America*, by Arthur Hobson Quinn, who long has occupied a chair of English Literature in the University of Pennsylvania. He insists that the political and social movements of each period may be best understood not through the economics, but

through the literature of the times. Professor Quinn finds in Irving and Cooper the motives which animated colonial America to struggle for freedom and individuality. Readers of Lowell's poetry understand the Civil War and readers of Howell's *Rise of Silas Lapham* learn that the decades following the Civil War saw something more than unrelieved corruption. The historical novels of Winston Churchill, which became the vogue subsequent to the Spanish War, reflect the new national feeling of that era. Professor Quinn believes that the reason the masses of England sympathized with the Union during the Civil War was because they knew their Longfellow better than their Tennyson.

The seven qualities of the American soul which he regards as most characteristic are democracy, efficiency, liberality, provincialism, individuality, humor and vision. Pride and reproach are both in this portrayal and the reader is prepared for Professor Quinn's conclusion that "the most hopeful quality of the American soul is its perennial discontent."

# INDEX—VOLUME I

[The Index for Volume I is printed last in order that it may be detached and inserted in the last Number of Volume I.]

## A

Antecedents of the Great Depression: *Hunt*, 510.  
Atkinson: World Religious Leaders and International Peace, 374.  
Azling: The Kingdom of God Movement in Japan, 521.

## B

Barnes: The Liberal Shibboleth, 588.  
Baylis: Philosophy for Ministers, 578.  
Beales: Group Movements in Religion, 22.  
Belden: Religion: Phantasy or Reality? 451  
Bernhardt: A Preface to Theology, 358.  
Bets: Religion as a Social Control, 219.  
Books That Have Annoyed Me—and Some Others:  
    *Roberts*, 494.  
Bowie: The Need of a Civic Conscience, 339.  
Bradley: Prayer, 419.  
Branscomb: Germany's Great Defeat, 599.  
Brightman: The Given and Its Critics, 134.  
Buck: The Romance of Tradition in Literature, 277.

## C

Cabot: Religion and Medicine, 267.  
Calhoun: Theology and History, 441  
Can We Honestly Be Optimists? *Hodgkin*, 614.  
Casert: Protestant Co-operation in Social Action, 431.  
Christian Doctrine in Ibsen's "Peer Gynt": *Rølvaag*, 70.  
Christianity and Recent Tendencies in American Sociology: *Ellwood*, 169.  
Christianity and the Supernatural: *Shaw*, 502.  
Church and the Cause of Christ, The: *Steiner*, 594.  
Conscience and War: *Macintosh*, 115.  
Courtis: Education, the Scales for Weighing Religion, 530.  
Craig: The New Testament in 1931, 36.  
Culture and Discipline of the Soul, The: *Whitham*, 350.

## D

Deismann: The Parable of the Prodigal Son, 331.  
Dickinson: Music and Worship, 230.  
Dutcher: Higher Education in the Far East, 239.

## E

Education, the Scales for Weighing Religion: *Courtis*, 530.  
Ellwood: Christianity and Recent Tendencies in American Sociology, 169.  
Ethic of Jesus and the Social Problem, The: *Reinhold Niebuhr*, 198.

## F

Faith, Works, and Social Salvation: *H. R. Niebuhr*, 426.

## G

Germany's Great Defeat: *Branscomb*, 599.  
Goodspeed: "The Translators to the Reader," 407.  
Group Movements in Religion: *Beales*, 22.

## H

Herman: Karl Barth: Promise or Peril? 395.  
Higher Education in the Far East: *Dutcher*, 239.  
*Hodgkin*: Can We Honestly Be Optimists? 614.  
*Hough*: Recent Arrivals on My Shelves, 121.  
*Hunt*: Antecedents of the Great Depression, 510.

## I

Idea of God in Recent Literature, The: *Roll*, 55.  
If Wesley Came Back to the World: *Wilson*, 256.  
Israel: Religion and the Social Order, 47.

## J

Jdasi: Proposed Roads to Peace, 483.

## K

Karl Barth: Promise or Peril? *Herman*, 395.  
Kingdom of God Movement in Japan, The: *Azling*, 521.

## L

Liberal Shibboleth, The: *Barnes*, 588.  
Literature and Life: *Shillito*, 388.

## M

McCall: The Modern Interest in Jesus, 288.  
McConnell: Religion in Life, 3.  
Macintosh: Conscience and War, 115.  
Mackenzie: The Sin of Accidie, 115.  
Mather: Religion in the Light of Contemporary Science, 14.  
Modern Interest in Jesus, The: *McCall*, 288.  
Moffatt: Troeltsch's Masterpiece, 301.  
Munson: The Religious Note in Robert Frost, 609.  
Music and Worship: *Dickinson*, 230.

## N

Need of a Civic Conscience, The: *Bowie*, 339.  
New Testament in 1931, The: *Craig*, 36.  
*Niebuhr, H. R.*: Faith, Works, and Social Salvation, 426.  
*Niebuhr, Reinhold*: The Ethic of Jesus and the Social Problem, 198.

## O

Oznam: Some Barriers Blocking the March to the New World, 323.

## P

Parable of the Prodigal Son, The: *Deismann*, 331.  
*Paterson*: Some Ethical Insights of Prophecy, 540.  
Philosophy for Ministers: *Baylis*, 578.  
Prayer: *Bradley*, 419.  
Preface to Theology, A: *Bernhardt*, 358.  
Progress of Christian Education, The: *Vieth*, 293.  
Prologue of the Fourth Gospel: Is it Jewish, Greek, or What? *Tyng*, 551.  
Proposed Roads to Peace: *Jdasi*, 483.  
Protestant Co-operation in Social Action: *Casert*, 431.

## R

*Roll*: The Idea of God in Recent Literature, 55.  
Recent Arrivals on My Shelves: *Hough*, 121.  
Recent Excavations and Bible Study: *Sellers*, 90.  
Recovery of the Soul, The: *Younts*, 209.  
Religion: Phantasy or Reality? *Belden*, 451.  
Religion and Medicine: *Cabot*, 267.  
Religion and the Social Order: *Israel*, 47.  
Religion as a Social Control: *Bets*, 219.  
Religion in Life: *McConnell*, 3.  
Religion in the Light of Contemporary Science: *Mather*, 14.  
Religious Note in Robert Frost, The: *Munson*, 609.  
Revised Marriage Canon, A: *Robbins*, 191.  
*Robbins*: A Revised Marriage Canon, 191.  
*Roberts*: Books That Have Annoyed Me—and Some Others, 494.  
*Rølvaag*: Christian Doctrine in Ibsen's "Peer Gynt," 70.  
Romance of Tradition in Literature, The: *Buck*, 277.

## S

*Sellers*: Recent Excavations and Bible Study, 90.  
*Shaw*: Christianity and the Supernatural, 502.  
*Shillito*: Literature and Life, 388.  
Sin of Accidie, The: *Mackenzie*, 115.  
*Slosson*: The Three Kinds of Atheism, 557.  
Some Barriers Blocking the March to the New World: *Oznam*, 323.  
Some Ethical Insights of Prophecy: *Paterson*, 540.

*Spiritual Base of Human Society, The: Stifter, 570.*  
*Steiner: The Church and the Cause of Christ, 594.*  
*Stifter: The Spiritual Base of Human Society, 570.*

## T

*The Given and Its Critics: Brightman, 134.*  
*Theocentric Religion: Wieman, 102.*  
*Theology and History: Calhoun, 441.*  
*Three Kinds of Atheism, The: Slosson, 557.*  
*"Translators to the Reader, The": Goodspeed, 407.*  
*Trends in Contemporary Theism: Van Dusen, 179.*  
*Troeltsch's Masterpiece: Moffatt, 301.*  
*Tying: Prologue of the Fourth Gospel: Is It Jewish, Greek, or What? 551.*

## U

*Understanding the Common People: Wicks, 563.*

## V

*Van Dusen: Trends in Contemporary Theism, 179.*  
*Vietz: The Progress of Christian Education, 293.*

## W

*Whitham: The Culture and Discipline of the Soul, 350.*  
*Wicks: Understanding the Common People, 563.*  
*Wieman: Theocentric Religion, 102.*  
*Wilson: If Wesley Came Back to the World, 256.*  
*World Religious Leaders and International Peace: Atkinson, 374.*

## Y

*Yount: The Recovery of the Soul, 209.*  
*Book Reviews: 146, 308, 463, 625.*  
*Bookish Brevities: 157, 319, 478, 638.*  
*Discussion: 304, 461.*

122



